

# The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

JANUARY 1942

## THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF THE GOSPELS

THE ministry and teaching of Jesus were projected against a background of life and thought of which most of us are largely ignorant except in so far as the Gospels themselves supply the data of knowledge. We are not so much concerned with the political background,<sup>1</sup> though there is much to be said for the theory that some of our Lord's words about non-resistance find their true explanation in the eager propaganda of the Zealots, who were thus endangering the peace of the land. But we do know that the death of Jesus was the climax of a protracted vendetta carried on against Him by religious opponents, and that an unholy coalition of Pharisees and Herodians brought about the retreat from Galilee, and the concerted action of Pharisees and Sadducees secured his surrender to the Roman procurator on a charge of high treason.<sup>2</sup>

The conflict with the Sadducees need not surprise us. They were the lineal descendants of those worldlings who came to easy terms with Antiochus Epiphanes, and now they harvested the ample revenues of the Temple. This institution was a vast religious monopoly. Annas, Caiaphas and the other members of the high-priestly family were prehensile ecclesiastics who loved power and knew how to keep it in their own hands. Whatever else Jesus may have done to arouse their antagonism, the reforming zeal that swept the money changers from the courts was too bold a challenge to vested interests to escape swift and effective retribution. The Essenes were an obscure and eccentric sect who lived in communities on the

<sup>1</sup> In addition to Schürer's well-known work, English readers can find information in Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925) and F. C. Grant's *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (1926).

<sup>2</sup> For the sectarian background see J. W. Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ* (1925), and T. W. Manson, *Sadducees and Pharisees: The Origin and Significance of the Names* (reprinted from 'The Bulletin of John Rylands Library', xxii, 1; April 1938).

east of Jordan; they need not detain us. But the Pharisees were the salt of the nation, the people who took religion seriously and delighted in the law of the Lord, in whose law they meditated day and night. It was they who had kept religion alive in Palestine, and had preserved the faith once for all delivered to the saints of Israel. But for them the national unity and reverence for the Torah would have perished long before under the disintegrating influences of alien aggression and the pervasive atmosphere of Hellenism. Yet strange as it seems to us when we bear this fact in mind, the ministry of Jesus at its beginning and at its close is largely occupied by bitter controversy with the Pharisees. They appear in the Gospel narrative not only as unscrupulous opponents but as narrow bigots, as hard-hearted legalists, with a stereotyped ceremonial, an inflexible orthodoxy, a lifeless creed. Over against this sapless religion, with all its disproportionate legal enactments and tedious catalogue of requirements, stands the fresh gospel of Jesus Christ. Here we are conscious of all that we miss in the Judaism of familiar description. There is a sense of what is vital in religion; the inner motive is what matters, not the external form or the correct ritual. First things come first, and the spontaneous impulse of the heart is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices, than the rinsing of cups and the posture for prayers.

Yet even the most reverent Christian student must sometimes ask himself whether this contrast is just what an impartial judge would set before us as the whole of the truth. We know that the Jews have never accepted the Gospel description of the predominant religion of Palestine as anything but a malicious caricature. Now in recent years there has been a marked change of attitude on both sides. In 1909 that distinguished scholar of Liberal Judaism, Dr. Claude Montefiore, brought out in two handsome volumes a commentary on the Synoptic Gospels, based largely on the works of such radical critics as Wellhausen, Loisy, Holtzmann, and Johannes Weiss, in which he sought to bring before his Jewish compatriots the life and teaching of Jesus in the light of competent critical investigation. (This was superseded sixteen years later by a new edition entirely rewritten so as to take into further

account the work of Burkitt, Streeter, Lake and Bultmann.) His purpose was to commend Jesus to them as the greatest of their Rabbis. In 1912 that erudite Unitarian scholar, Dr. Travers Herford, writing from the Christian side, brought out a book on *Pharisaism*<sup>1</sup> which draws on a lifetime devoted to rabbinical study to defend the religion of the Pharisees from the alleged misrepresentation it suffers in the Gospels and in centuries of Christian thought. It is only within the last few years that English students have been put in a position to study the teaching of Jesus against its Jewish background. When the present writer left college thirty-six years ago there was no reliable commentary on St. Matthew in English. In 1906 Archdeacon Willoughby Allen brought out his valuable work in the *International Critical Commentary*, but the exigencies of Synoptic criticism left him inadequate room to make full use of his great stores of Aramaic learning. The best feature of McNeile's commentary in 1915 was the full attention paid to rabbinical parallels. A few years later (1922) Canon Box in his new edition of St. Matthew in the *Century Bible* drew on his almost unsurpassed knowledge of Jewish theology to set the teaching of our Master in its true relation to contemporary Judaism. This is a small book which comes within the range of all, and even those who cannot accept some of the critical views set forth in the introduction will find passage after passage in the Gospel interpreted by a master in this field of exegesis. The latest commentaries in which excellent use is made of rabbinic illustrations are Professor T. W. Manson's invaluable exposition of the teaching of Jesus in the composite work *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (1937) and Dr. B. T. D. Smith's *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels* (1937). Of course such information is not quite new. That seventeenth-century pundit, Dr. John Lightfoot, in his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*,<sup>2</sup> gathered together a mass of rabbinical parallels to illustrate the New Testament, and it must be more than sixty years since Dr. Charles Taylor of Cambridge brought out his well-known edition of the Sayings of the Fathers. But between the wars the S.P.C.K. has been bringing out

<sup>1</sup> The same writer to some extent replaced this book by another, *The Pharisees* (1924).

<sup>2</sup> My own copy is the 'new edition' by R. Gandell in 4 vols. (Oxford, 1859).

not only this but also other important tractates from the Mishnah in a handy form with an excellent introduction and commentary. Still more significant of the new trend was the inclusion in Peake's one-volume Commentary of an article by Dr. Claude Montefiore, 'Contemporary Jewish Religion'. Of course such scholars as Drs. Oesterley and Box in numerous books from the Christian side, and Dr. Israel Abrahams from that of Judaism,<sup>1</sup> have done much for the discussion of obscure points, and in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* we have a mine of information. Only a few years ago we were still a long way behind Germany in this respect and we badly needed an English translation of Bousset's *Religion of Judaism in the New Testament Age*<sup>2</sup> as a companion to the English translation of Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*.<sup>3</sup> It is even more to be wished that an English translation could be arranged for the monumental work in four massive volumes by two German scholars, Strack and Billerbeck. This is a *Commentary on the New Testament in the light of the Talmud and Midrash* (1922-28), the first volume dealing entirely with St. Matthew's Gospel. Here as nowhere else it is possible for those of us who are New Testament students without being in any sense Talmudic scholars to find collected an exhaustive list, well classified, with dates and references, of all the passages from Jewish literature that will throw light upon a New Testament text. Someone may ask, But is there nothing systematic in English? Happily recent years have brought us great enrichment where we felt our poverty. In 1927 the American scholar, G. F. Moore of Harvard, brought out in two magnificent volumes his work on *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, followed in 1930 by a supplementary volume of notes and short dissertations. This is more than a quarry of valuable information. It is an entrancing exposition of Jewish doctrine, ritual and practice arranged under such headings as 'Revealed Religion', 'The Idea of God', 'Man, Sin and Atonement', 'Observances', 'Morals', 'Piety', 'The Hereafter'. Dr. Monte-

<sup>1</sup> Especially his *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (1st Ser. 1917, 2nd Ser. 1924), also his essay 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis' in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909).

<sup>2</sup> 3rd edition revised by Hugo Gressmann (1926).

<sup>3</sup> Both Bousset and Schürer have been severely criticized for their superficial knowledge of rabbinical Judaism.



fiore's *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings* (1930) tells us more about Jewish parallels to the teaching of our Lord than his commentary. Those who want further samples of what the Rabbis taught will find a rich selection in *A Rabbinic Anthology* (1938), selected and arranged with comments and introductions by Dr. Montefiore and his friend Mr. Loewe. They represented one the Liberal, the other the Orthodox, Judaism of our time. There is a whimsical wit which breaks out irrepressibly in their introductions, and also a grace of spirit and of style which lures one to what at first sight might seem an uncongenial theme. A pathetic significance attaches to this last book of theirs, for Montefiore died just before its publication and Loewe lasted only for a year or two longer. The Birmingham Rabbi, Dr. A. Cohen, has given us a handy little book in *Everyman's Talmud* (1932), and Canon Danby, late of Jerusalem, now Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford, has produced an English translation of the Mishnah (1933).

But Rabbinical Judaism is not the only field for the study of Jewish thought in the time of Christ. There is a vast literature of Apocalyptic in which much of the most ardent piety found expression. Here we may well feel proud of what English scholarship has achieved. Germany falls behind us now, for Kautzsch's edition is not to be compared with the two noble volumes of the Oxford Apocrypha edited by Archdeacon Charles and his team of British scholars.<sup>1</sup> Now it is just at this point that one of our first questions arises. Where are we to look for the material to enable us to judge the religion against which the message of Jesus arose in protest? There are those like Bousset who find it almost entirely in this Jewish Apocalyptic. They point out that the Mishnah was not completed till the end of the second century of our era, whereas such books as the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Assumption of Moses* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* present us with doctrines that were actually current in the time of Jesus. To this it is replied that the apocalyptic writings were really heretical and were never honoured with official sanction, and that if we want to study the authorized doctrine by which alone Judaism should be judged we must go

<sup>1</sup> *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913).

to the rabbinical literature. While it is true that the Mishnah was not given its present form till the end of the second century, and the Tosephta was later, and the Talmud still later, yet continuity was of the very essence of rabbinical teaching and the oral tradition was preserved with the utmost fidelity. For our purpose it is well to recognize the value of each of these sources, Jewish Apocalyptic for the evidence there given of the ardent piety inspired with faith and hope drawn from Psalmist and Prophet, the Mishnah for the official and orthodox teaching of the Scribes. These complementary sources should put us on our guard against postulating a rigid uniformity of type in Palestinian religion.

The next question touches our Lord's originality. What is the relation between the teaching of Jesus and the rabbinical parallels to it which are so often quoted? We are in little danger of falling into the old snare of declaring that the best sayings in the Talmud have been plagiarized from the Gospels. But we must also recognize the possibility that not only actual sayings, but still more the selective emphasis, of Jesus influenced the teaching of the Rabbis and brought a new spirit into their treatment of some questions.<sup>1</sup> The main thing to remember is that his supremacy as a teacher does not depend upon his having been the first to coin a phrase or to express a thought. Jesus often quotes from the Old Testament, yet no one would say that his treatment of the Old Testament is anything but original. It may well be that in his boyhood Jesus received impressions in the synagogue that became part of his spiritual heritage. It is even possible that during periodic visits to the Holy City he listened to some of the discussions in which Hillel spoke words of gracious wisdom. At any rate his soul was nurtured in the piety that fed upon the Torah and lived in the blissful atmosphere of the 119th Psalm. For all that, there is a vast difference between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Jewish tradition at its highest and best. For the present we must be content with two reasons in support of this assertion. (a) The negative consideration has been put in

<sup>1</sup> This principle is accepted, though with a limited application, by Israel Abrahams (*Camb. Bibl. Essays*, p. 187). R. Travers Herford rejects it. (See his *Judaism in the New Testament Period* (1928), pp. 190 ff.)

well-known words by Wellhausen: 'Jewish scholars think that all that Jesus said is found in the Talmud. Yes, all and a good deal more. The originality of Jesus consists in this, that he had the feeling for what was true and eternal amid a chaotic mass of rubbish, and that He enunciated it with the greatest emphasis.'<sup>1</sup> (b) The positive consideration cannot be put more effectively than in the words of Dr. Montefiore himself: 'When Talmud and Gospels are compared, the originality is almost always on the side of the Gospels. But this is not my present point. . . . A great personality is more than the record of its teaching, and the teaching is more than the bits of it taken one by one. It must be viewed as a whole. . . . There is a certain spirit and glow about the teaching of Jesus which you either appreciate or fail to appreciate. . . . This teaching which has had such gigantic effects upon the world is more and other than a dissected list of injunctions. It is not merely the sum of its parts: it is a whole, a spirit. That spirit has the characteristics of genius. It is great, stimulating, heroic.'<sup>2</sup>

A third question we may ask is: In what definite points does the teaching of Jesus pass beyond that of his orthodox Jewish contemporaries? Here again we can only select two or three points where many others might be mentioned, and we must not forget that some Jewish scholars would contest even those which we shall now briefly consider. (a) The fundamental truth in the Gospels is that of the Fatherhood of God. This, of course, is found in the Old Testament, but rather in the sense of a peculiar relationship between God and His own nation. With all the warm glow of personal religion that marks the use of this term in the piety of Judaism it never quite loses the sense of national possession. The undistinguishing regard of God for all the children of men is surely one of the distinctive notes in the message of Jesus. It may well be that Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus at the end of the first century said, 'Who is there on whom to lean, except our Father who is in heaven?',<sup>3</sup> and that Rabbi Abbahu at the

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, by G. Wauchope Stewart in *D.C.G.*, ii, 290.

<sup>2</sup> *The Synoptic Gospels*, ed. 2, i, pp. cxxxix f.

<sup>3</sup> *Sotah*, 9, 15 (*The Mishnah*, tr. H. Danby, p. 306).

end of the third century said, 'The day on which it has rained is greater than the resurrection of the dead, for the latter is only for the righteous; the rain, however, is for righteous and ungodly alike.'<sup>1</sup> But there is a greater depth of meaning in those words in the Sermon on the Mount: 'Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.' (b) Closely allied to this is the teaching about forgiveness. Everyone recognizes in this one of the most distinctive contributions which Christianity has made to ethics. Now one of the most fascinating chapters in Archdeacon Charles's little book on *Religious Development between New and Old Testaments*<sup>2</sup> is that in which he traces the slow progress from the vengeful spirit that is almost normal in the Old Testament through the nobler conceptions in *Ecclesiasticus* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* until we have the incomparable law of Christian forgiveness in the Gospels. It is acknowledged that in the rabbinical teaching of a later time stress is laid on this obligation. It is unfortunate, however, that both R. H. Charles and G. H. Box (presumably after John Lightfoot<sup>3</sup>), as also W. C. Allen<sup>4</sup> and A. H. McNeile,<sup>5</sup> misrepresent a saying attributed to Rabbi Jose ben Judah.<sup>6</sup> He is made to say that a man may forgive his neighbour three times but not more, quoting Amos ii. 6 in support of this limitation. But Strack and Billerbeck<sup>7</sup> show that this is due to a misreading of the original. It is God's forgiveness that is represented as limited to the case of a sinner who commits the same offence four times over. This is, of course, a rabbinical exegesis of the words in Amos, 'For three transgressions of Israel, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof.' As this is often quoted as evidence that Jewish teaching is in opposition to Christ's on the obligation to forgive, it is only right to remove the misunderstanding. (c) Closely related again is our Lord's teaching about rewards and retribution. Following the verses

<sup>1</sup> *Ta'an. 7a. (Rabbinic Anthology, p. 368).* [For these and similar quotations see Strack-Billerbeck, i, pp. 374, 394.] <sup>2</sup> In the Home University Library (1914).

<sup>3</sup> *Horae Hebr.*, ii, p. 259.

<sup>4</sup> *I.C.C.*, p. 199.

<sup>5</sup> *Commentary on St. Matt.*, p. 268.

<sup>6</sup> Babylonian Talmud, *Yoma* 86 b.

<sup>7</sup> *Kommentar*, i, pp. 796 f.

from the Sermon on the Mount about the Fatherhood of God comes this saying: 'For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye?' Let us observe Dr. Montefiore's comment on this verse: 'Another blow for tit for tat. Jesus is always at his best when he attacks this doctrine. He is then most truly original.'<sup>1</sup> We may compare with this his note on the Parable of Extra Service in Luke xvii. 7-10: 'It is most notable that man can claim no reward from God. That was not quite original teaching, but it was so relatively. The tilt against exaggerations and perversions of the doctrine of tit for tat is a prominent and characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus. What we receive from God is grace and goodness, and not reward. There is no doubt that the excessive emphasis and elaboration of the doctrine of retribution was one of the weak spots in Rabbinic Judaism. In no other point is Jesus' antagonism to, and reaction against, certain tendencies in that teaching more justified and more wholesome than here.'<sup>2</sup>

(d) The climax of our Lord's teaching Dr. Montefiore finds in Luke xix. 10: 'The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.' His comment deserves attention. 'Here in this noble verse we have once more an original utterance of the greatest importance and significance. The Rabbis spoke much of the imitation of God. But I do not find that they bade man imitate God in regard to that one of his activities which God describes in Ezekiel xxxiv. 16, the verse upon which Luke xix. 10 is obviously based.'<sup>3</sup> 'For the ostracized and ignored . . . Jesus had a new message; He gave them a new hope; he brought to them a compassion and a love to which they had been unused before.'<sup>4</sup> 'So far as we can tell this pity for the sinner was a new note in religious history.'

There is, however, a question, raised a little earlier, to which some sort of answer must be given. How can we account for the vehement and bitter polemic which Jesus indulged in against the Scribes and Pharisees without any acknowledgment of the nobler elements in their teaching? An answer may be attempted along three different paths.

<sup>1</sup> *Syn. Gosp.*, ed. 1, ii, p. 521 (omitted from ed. 2, ii, p. 82).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ed. 1, ii, p. 1009. The last sentence is omitted from ed. 2 (ii, p. 543).

<sup>3</sup> *Rabbinical Literature and Gospel Teachings*, p. 372.

<sup>4</sup> *Peake's Commentary*, p. 622 a.

<sup>5</sup> *Syn. Gospels*, ed. 2, ii, p. 141.

(a) It may be said that the words of Jesus were first committed to writing many years after they were spoken, and however trustworthy the record is so far as the trend and substance of the teaching are concerned, the context has been influenced by the later experience of the Church.

(b) Others suggest that the controversies were not carried on with the scribes of Hillel's school, who were mostly to be found in force in Jerusalem, but with the followers of Shammai, whose system was far more rigid and pedantic than that of Hillel. There seems some reason to believe that this was the predominant school in Galilee. In that case we have an example of the tendency that shows itself elsewhere in the logical fallacy of reasoning *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, i.e. words spoken by Jesus with a definite limitation have been applied by the evangelists to the Scribes and Pharisees as a class without qualification.

(c) Dr. Herford attributes the situation as faithfully recorded in the Gospel to a fundamental difference in the conception of religion held by Jesus and the Pharisees. From this he goes on to affirm an inability on the part both of the Pharisees and of Jesus to understand and to do justice to the religious position of the other side.<sup>1</sup> Let us look at these suggestions a little more closely.

(a) It has been said that the controversies between Jesus and the Pharisees in their present form are a reflection of the later controversies between the Christian Church and orthodox Judaism. At first sight there is much to commend this theory. From the standpoint of sound Synoptic criticism of the sources we are bound to observe a certain anti-Pharisaic bias in St. Matthew. Archdeacon Allen may be quoted in support of this assertion. 'The editor of the first Gospel extends the anti-Pharisaism of his sources. He not only borrows the polemical sayings from the Logia and the polemical incidents from St. Mark, but so arranges and adds to them as to give a very dark picture of the Pharisees.'<sup>2</sup> It is, of course, still more clear that the writer of the Fourth Gospel thinks of all the opponents of Jesus as blind and bitter enemies like those who assailed the Church in his time. Party names generally

<sup>1</sup> *Pharisaism*, pp. 170 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *I.C.C.*, St. Matthew, p. lxxviii.



merge in the one opprobrious term 'the Jews'. But Jewish scholars<sup>1</sup> warn us against the popular critical tendency to regard the controversies of the Fourth Gospel as unhistorical, and assure us that they bear every mark of genuineness. And when we have allowed the necessary discount for Matthew's editorial bias, the situation described in Mark is too consistent and intelligible a picture to be explained away.

(b) There is much more to be said for the second theory, that Jesus did not condemn Pharisaism root and branch, but was constantly engaged in exposing a particular form of scribal religion. It is well known that there were those who brought Pharisaism into disrepute. We need not go outside the Talmud for evidence of this. One passage<sup>2</sup> is often referred to in which Pharisees are divided under seven heads: (1) the 'shoulder' Pharisee, who wore openly on his shoulders a list of his own good actions; (2) the 'temporizing' Pharisee, who begged for time in order to perform a good deed; (3) the 'calculating' Pharisee, who said 'my sins are more than counterbalanced by my many virtues'; (4) the 'saving' Pharisee, who said 'I will save a little from my modest fortune to perform a work of charity'; (5) the Pharisee who said, 'would that I knew of a sin which I had committed, in order that I might make reparation by an act of virtue'; (6) the man who is a Pharisee from fear (of whom Job was curiously taken as a type); (7) the Pharisee who is one from love of God (with Abraham as exemplar). Of these only the last two were deemed worthy of praise.

But quite apart from pompous and pretentious Pharisees whom Jesus held up to ridicule, there may well have been conflicting schools and tendencies of scribal teachers in Galilee during this transition age. Dr. Israel Abrahams,<sup>3</sup> in trying to account for the surprise aroused by the teaching of Jesus 'as one having authority', thinks that at this time the formation of schools of exegesis was in process of development, and that the method of Hillel, with its comparative freedom from the burden of tradition, was little known in Galilee,

<sup>1</sup> E.g., I. Abrahams, *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, p. 181; *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, i, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.* iv, 338. They cite other such classifications, one of which is given by Klausner, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies in Phar. and the Gospels*, i, p. 15.

where the method of Shammai burdened the people with the yoke of precedent. Canon Box<sup>1</sup> goes further, and thinks that the Gospels furnish evidence that in the disputes recorded in Mark vii (and Matthew xv) Jesus was resisting an attempt made by some Shammaite scribes from Jerusalem to force their rigid practices upon a people who had not been accustomed to observe them. He adds significantly that, according to the Talmud, the duty of ritual handwashing formed one of the eighteen articles which the Shammaites forced with such violence on the Sanhedrin in the stormy years that immediately preceded the conflict with Rome. This explanation seems to be the clue we need to understand both the debate about the handwashing, and the strange counter-challenge which Jesus flung down in the taunt about Corban. The difficulty about ablutions is that only priests were under obligation to observe this ritual handwashing. Now it is clear from this narrative that there had been no trouble on this subject before these propagandists from Jerusalem arrived. Their objection was that a Rabbi should allow his disciples to neglect the rite. The disciples were laymen, and there was no scriptural ordinance that imposed any such necessity upon them. The discussion becomes intelligible if we can attribute to this period the first attempt by Shammai's followers to extend the scope of this regulation to those who were not priests. Is this not the solution also to the most vexed of all questions belonging to this controversy? The Corban passage is always a source of resentment to Jewish scholars who claim that the charge is in flat contradiction of the law as laid down in the Mishnah, and commented upon in the Talmud. The phrase is not easy as it stands in the Greek text, and possibly the Sinaitic Syriac version preserves the original form of words: 'Corban! if thou shalt be profited from me!' The meaning is that the Scribes allow an angry oath of refusal to help parents to stand as binding. Now the very discussion of this subject in the Mishnah shows that the question must at one time have been in dispute. In view of the victory of the Hillelite school in the period which followed the destruction of Jerusalem, it is not to be wondered at that the

<sup>1</sup> *Cent. Bible*, St. Matthew, pp. 244 f.

more liberal and humane doctrine of the binding value of oaths became the settled law of the Talmud. But it is hard to see why such a saying as this should have been attributed to Jesus unless He had actually spoken it, and it is more reasonable to infer that this was a protest against an extreme doctrine of the inviolability of oaths taken up at this time by the uncompromising school of Shammai.<sup>1</sup>

(c) Last of all we come to Dr. Travers Herford's contention, which is that Jesus failed entirely to understand the fundamental religious position of the Pharisees. He pleads with us to look at the matter not from our modern standpoint but from that of the Pharisees themselves. Jesus claimed to be a Jew who was loyal to the Torah. That included both the written scriptures and the tradition which had grown up as interpretation. Much freedom of interpretation was allowed, but a teacher who set at nought the consensus of opinion of the most highly venerated names in their religious history was provoking trouble. That, however, is not the main charge. It was not only their interpretation of the Scripture that was thrown over; Jesus even set aside the authority of Scripture itself. There were three occasions on which the Pharisees came into sharp collision with him. These were over the questions of ( $\alpha$ ) the Sabbath, ( $\beta$ ) divorce, ( $\gamma$ ) distinctions between the clean and the unclean. ( $\alpha$ ) In the first of these the claim of the Pharisees was that it is meaningless to talk of keeping the Sabbath day holy unless there were some general understanding of what is necessary and what unnecessary on that day. As the result of long years of study and experiment the regulations of their oral tradition had been established, and now everyone knew quite well what it involved. Jesus had done violence to the public conscience and endangered a national institution ordained by God Himself by His healing of a man who could have come for healing the next day. This was not an instance of an urgent deed of mercy, which was allowed for in the Torah. ( $\beta$ ) The next dispute, that about divorce, was even more revolutionary in its result, for here Jesus did definitely break not only with the unwritten law

<sup>1</sup> See Box, *Cent. Bible*, St. Matthew, pp. 245 f. Bartlet, *Cent. Bible*, St. Mark, pp. 218 ff. 226 ff. Montefiore, *Syn. Gosp.*, ed. 1, i, pp. 162 ff.; ed. 2, i, pp. 145 ff.

but with the very scriptures which He in common with them regarded as the very word of God. (γ) The same must be said of the saying which abolished at one stroke the undeniable distinctions laid down in the Pentateuch between things clean and things unclean. In view of these open and unambiguous departures from the religion of Torah how could the Pharisees do anything else than oppose one who seemed to them to be undermining the most precious national possession? To say that Jesus delivered them from the innumerable burdens of petty observance is not to the point, for they did not find these things tedious, and in their great love for their Father and in devotion to His will they looked upon the carrying out of these His most trifling wishes with scrupulous care as no duty but a joy. Moreover, we are told that the Rabbis always lay the utmost stress upon the joyfulness of this and all service to God.

May we not go some way in sympathy with those good men whose hearts were sorely perplexed by the strangeness of the teaching of this revolutionary? We are not always so quick to discern the new aspects of familiar truth, or to break away from the hardening influence of tradition, call it orthodoxy or by any other name. In view of the sad history of those centuries when the Jews suffered a living martyrdom at the hands of those who professed their loyalty to Christ it ill becomes us to adopt a censorious pose towards our Lord's contemporaries whose blindness of heart contributed to the supreme tragedy of history. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged', is the most relevant text for our admonition. Nor does the normal standard of character and conduct prevailing among the company of those who profess and call themselves Christians suggest that we can read the woes pronounced upon the Scribes and Pharisees without wincing. For the Pharisees, as that word has come to be used in modern speech, is the name not of a sect in Judaism but of a temperament which is met with wherever religion is the ruling passion of life.<sup>1</sup> Yet though humility is the only attitude in which we can rightly approach these conflicts of other days, our historical judgement

<sup>1</sup> See J. B. Mozley's searching analysis of this timeless tendency in his *University Sermons*, pp. 25-45.

must not overlook certain factors which are sometimes ignored by modern apologists for first-century Judaism. Jesus was in the line of the prophetic interpretation of Hebrew religion, according to which 'the moral was the essential and congruous expression of the heart's loyalty to Israel's God, and His ways; the ritual was only the contingent and more artificial medium of such expression'.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, in the words of Professor H. G. Wood, 'to rehabilitate Pharisaism as a spiritual religion we must excuse the Crucifixion'.<sup>2</sup> For, though it was the Sadducaic high-priestly party which must bear the chief blame for the death of Jesus, all the evidence goes to show that Jesus met with implacable opposition from the leaders of official Judaism who saw in his teaching a threat to the nation's religion. In the third place the conflict was between insight and tradition. And on this we may well close with a tribute from that gracious scholar whose love of his national religion deepened his sympathies with the Pharisees and at the same time opened his eyes to the greatness of the greatest of all Israel's teachers, whom we Christians hail as Lord. 'Looking back . . . we see that while both parties had a certain right upon their side, though neither could persuade the other, Jesus was more profoundly right and more essentially true. The future was with Him, not with the Rabbis and Pharisees. His principle would gradually win the day. It represented a higher and purer conception of religion than the opposing principle which is embodied in the Pentateuchal Law. . . . Jesus himself, with His keen moral and spiritual intuitions, went straight to the essential truths of religion.'<sup>3</sup>

In this article we have of necessity dealt with some of the more controversial issues which are raised by the study of the Gospels against their background in the religion of Judaism. On a later occasion we may hope to leave this aspect of the subject, and illustrate the great gain which we find for the understanding of our Lord's teaching as we bring under tribute the scholars who have devoted a lifetime to the study of Jewish religion.

W. F. HOWARD

<sup>1</sup> J. V. Bartlet, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> *Peake's Commentary*, p. 666 b.

<sup>3</sup> C. G. Montefiore, *Syn. Gosp.*, ed. 1, i, p. 176; ed. 2, i, p. 164.

## THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

### I

IN Apocalyptic books it was usual for the writer (a) to take his stand at some point in the past, and (b) to assume the name of some ancient hero who had lived at that point in history. It has generally been taken almost for granted that the Seer of the New Testament Apocalypse differed from other Apocalyptists *both* under (a) and under (b). The purpose of this article is to suggest that, while he did not take any ancient name, at least in the passage about the Three Woes, which forms the chief part of his book (viii. 13-xx. 6), he did begin from a point in the past, namely, from the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians *ca.* 588 B.C.

Some introductory notes seem to be necessary. First, for the Seer, Christianity was not so much 'a new Israel' as 'the true Israel'—organically continuous with the Israel of the Old Testament. There is one illustration out of a number in the phrase 'The Song of Moses and of the Lamb'. Secondly, the Seer set himself to encourage persecuted Christians to endure. As he taught that by this method they would 'inherit the earth', they may be called 'The Meek'. Their situation was not new. Ever since the fall of Jerusalem, *ca.* 588 B.C., the Jews had been under the heel of alien empires (apart from a brief interval in Maccabean times, and then only in Palestine). Throughout this period the question 'Why do the righteous suffer?' had been clamant,—so much so that the whole period might be called the Period of Tribulation. A number of attempts had been made to deal with this question in different kinds of books, but all Apocalypses claimed to give the Divine answer to it. They tried to vindicate a desperate theocracy. *Prima facie*, it does not seem unlikely that the Seer would go back to the destruction of Jerusalem by Babylon, for this was the beginning of the Period of Tribulation—and of the testing of the Meek. This is suggested, for instance, in the Seventh Chapter, where a selected hundred-and-forty-four-thousand *Israelites* are 'sealed' as 'the servants of our God'. It is true that the



## THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE 17

Seer does not use the name 'Babylon' until he is dealing with Rome (xiv. 8), but this is just a sign of his own kind of literary skill. His readers, if the suggestion here made is correct, would have been waiting for the name ever since they began to read of the three Woes. Thirdly, there were two books written near the beginning of the Period of Tribulation, Ezekiel and Daniel (as the Seer would date Daniel), and he makes very frequent use of these books, both by way of likeness and way of difference. A few examples will be given below. It is suggested here that for this writer there were three successive Babylons, or rather three successive forms of one Babylon: the first covering the literal Babylonian Empire's rule from *ca.* 588 B.C. to its fall before Cyrus, the second covering the Persian and Seleucid empires, and the third beginning with the Roman conquest of Jerusalem under Pompey in 63 B.C. To us it may seem strange at first that the second of these should be called 'Babylon', but it needs to be remembered that Cyrus called himself 'King of Babylon' from the day when he entered that city, that the Seleucid kings reckoned their reigns to begin when they entered, each in turn, into the Temple of Bel at Babylon, and that for the Seer the Persian and Seleucid and Roman empires would be the continuation of the rule of alien 'powers' that began with Babylon.

At this point we may look at certain cryptic numbers by which the Seer gives initiates in Apocalyptic hints of his chronology. The first hint lies in the phrase 'five months', which occurs twice in the First Woe in a way that has always perplexed non-initiates (ix. 5, 10). May I suggest that this is meant to be a clue to the secret of the numbers that follow at later points, and that the phrase 'five months' either means (a) 'Initiates will see that I am following the Month Clue (which they already know)', or (b) 'Initiates will here be able to see that I am going to use a Month Clue (whose nature they will readily discern)'. In Daniel, for instance, a 'day' stands for a year, and a 'week' for seven years, and the whole era covers fifty 'weeks' or 350 years. On this analogy a (lunar) 'month' would stand for 28 years, and 'five months' for 140 years. But the Jews, having no record of the length of the Exile except a passage in Jeremiah (xxv. 11f.), reckoned it

## 18 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

at seventy years. The Month Clue, therefore, would be, in effect—'When I say "five months" under the First Woe, I don't mean 140 years, but half that number; for you know that the Exile lasted seventy years; therefore, when you come to cryptic numbers below, *halve them*.' If this is done, what dates do we get? If the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians be taken as *ca.* 588 B.C., and the First Woe lasted seventy years, this would give *ca.* 518 B.C. as the beginning of the Second Woe. The Seer has no cryptic numbers, however, under this, but in his numbering takes the Second and Third Woes together. In xi. 1f. he says that the Second Temple is to last forty-two 'months'—that is, 588 years. If these are reckoned from *ca.* 518 B.C. we reach a date *ca.* 70 A.D., when Zerubbabel's temple was in fact destroyed. In xiii. 5 the power of a certain Brute (for this word gives the idea to-day better than 'Beast') is to last till the same date. In xi. 3 and xii. 6 a period of forty-five 'months', or 1,260 'days', is mentioned. If we follow the Month Clue this would give a period of 630 years, and from *ca.* 518 B.C. we should reach a date *ca.* 112 A.D. We shall find that this is the date when the Seer expected the Third (Roman) Woe to end. If the 'five months' of the First Woe are added to the forty-five of the Second and Third, we get a total of fifty 'months'—that is, according to the Month Clue, seven hundred years. The Seer's era is just twice as long as Daniel's. 'But', it may be asked, 'what about the most cryptic number of all, the Number of the Brute (xiii. 18)? If 666 is halved, we get 333 years, and what can this mean?' The Seer has himself given the answer. He says that *this* number is 'the number of a man'—that is, it is to be counted after the manner usual with men (cf. xxi. 17). Now if we count 666 usual years in an era beginning *ca.* 588 B.C., we reach *ca.* 78 A.D., and this, as we shall see, is about the date when the Seer was (or claimed to be) prophesying. Another note needs to be made about 666. It will be claimed below that it stood for a man as well as a date—and that, as usually held to-day, the man was Nero, the number being reached by writing 'Nero Caesar' in Hebrew characters and adding together the figures for which those characters stood. But this requires that the Seer's readers *already knew* that

666 stood for Nero, for it would be impossible for anyone who did not know this to start from the number and *work back* to Nero. The first problem, for instance, that he would have to face would be, 'Which of the very many sets of figures, of which *every* set totals 666, am I to choose?' The discovery of the cipher by modern scholars *began* from the supposition that the Brute was Nero Caesar, and worked to the 'number' by writing these two words in Hebrew, and not *vice versa*.

It is not possible here to examine the whole Book, and it may be well at this point to mention some things that are taken for granted below: (a) The Seer is a 'prophet', and his purpose is to preach. (b) His sermon is to the Meek. (c) In it he sets himself to encourage them to endure persecution, and he does this by saying: 'If only you are meek enough to endure with indomitable patience, in the end you will triumph; this is true even for those among you who have died or will die for Christ's sake; indeed, the truly meek are already victorious.' (d) 'You know this, for you are disciples of the meek Jesus, who triumphed just in this way. Is He not on the throne just because He was meek for our sakes?' Whenever the readers of the Book came to the word 'Lamb' they would instinctively think of this. (e) The triumph of the Meek is to come soon. (f) It will be accompanied by the punishment of their persecutors in the destruction of Rome, which too will come soon. (g) Being a good preacher, the Seer repeats his message again and again (each repetition none the less having its own distinct character), for he knows that this is needed to 'get his message across'. (h) At several points, again like a good preacher, he introduces his main message of encouragement in a way that he would not do if his mind were set on a consecutive historical record or on the logical development of thought. (i) In some passages his paragraphs do not describe successive events, but different parts of a single situation. It may be added that as one reads this Book, one gets the impression that in the second half of the First Century the persecution of Christians (or, more probably, of Jews and Christians taken together) was far more common than the few scattered references in extant Roman historians would

## 20 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

suggest. As we have seen, a chaotic situation was no novelty. In the period since *ca.* 588 B.C. Babylon had destroyed Jerusalem, Persia had conquered Babylon, Alexander had fought Persia, the Seleucids had fought the Ptolemies, Rome had fought Persia, the Seleucids, Pompey had captured Jerusalem, Rome had fought Parthia, Caesar had fought Pompey, Brutus and Cassius had fought Anthony and Octavian, Octavian had fought Anthony, Titus had sacked Jerusalem and torn down the Temple. In such a retrospect the Persian Peace and the brief period of Maccabean glory would seem at most 'exceptions that prove the rule'. No wonder the Seer symbolized such a piece of history as Seal on terrible Seal, Trumpet on shattering Trumpet, Woe on Woe.

### II

The description of the Three Woes begins at viii. 13. That of the First Woe is brief (ix. 1-11), but it is long enough (apart from the references to 'five months') to show that the Seer refers here to the historic Babylon. The Woe is depicted as a plague of locusts, which in the East furnish an obvious symbol for quick and thorough destruction (cf. Joel i). There are a number of Oracles against Babylon in the Prophetical Books, and one of their leading ideas is 'Babylon was a destroyer'. In these Oracles several Hebrew words are rendered 'destroy', but one of the more frequent is '*abad*'. In the Poetical Books there is a term *Abaddon* that derives from this. It is used as a synonym for *Sheol*—that is, it unites the two ideas of *Destruction* and '*the pit*'. One of the chief Oracles against Babylon is found in Isaiah xiii. and xiv. Here Babylon, the *Destroyer*, is connected with *Sheol* (Isaiah xiv. 9ff.). Here, too, there occurs the phrase 'How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning' (Isaiah xiv. 12). This phrase, along with the story of the Nephilim or Giants in Genesis vi. 1-4, seems to have been the origin of the doctrine of Fallen Angels. The earlier history of this doctrine is rather obscure, but it looks as if the two passages had long been connected with each other at the time of the Seer, for in Isaiah xiv. 9 the LXX renders a Hebrew word that means 'he-goats' by 'giants'. It is usually recognized that in the

## THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE 21

First Woe there is reference to the Isaianic Oracle, for it speaks of 'a star from heaven fallen unto the earth' who is also 'the angel of the abyss' (Revelation ix. 1, 11), but it has not always been sufficiently noticed that this Oracle is an Oracle *against Babylon*. For the Seer there is an Angel of Babylon, as there had been an Angel of Persia for Daniel (Daniel x. 13-21), but the Angel of Babylon is a Fallen Angel, who has been given the 'key' of 'the pit of the abyss', and who, having opened its door, lets out its hordes to lead them in destruction. His name is 'Abaddon', or Destroyer. Under the account of the Third Babylon there is a similar passage, yet with its own distinct character (xii. 7ff.). The word 'Abaddon' is the climax and epitome of the First Woe. It is quite possible that in Apocalyptic circles it was already a well-known name for Babylon. It should be noted that neither the First nor the Second Woe relates to the Jews *in exile* but to those in desolated Palestine and ruined Jerusalem.

As already stated, the Seer's account of the Second Woe (ix. 12-xi. 14) is here referred to the Persian-Seleucid period (ca. 518-63 B.C.). It falls into three parts, rightly divided in the paragraphs of the Revised Version. It begins with the 'loosing' of 'the four angels which are bound at the great river Euphrates'—that is, with Cyrus' conquest of 'the world', as Israel had previously known it. The Seer emphasizes the fact that this befell in exact accordance with his scheme of 'months' (ver. 15), the suggestion being that the Fall of Rome, like the Fall of the first Babylon, will also precisely agree with it. The 'four angels' are perhaps those of the Medes, Persians (or possibly the Mesopotamians), Elamites and Parthians (cf. Acts ii. 9). Parthia had from the first been part of the Persian Empire, for Darius the Great speaks of the Parthians as rebels (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. 'Parthians'). In the Seer's day, however, they had long been *the* power from beyond the Euphrates and were still contending, not unequally, with Rome itself. Perhaps the popular mind now identified them with the Persians. As they were famous for their cavalry, the armies from beyond the Euphrates are symbolized as 'horses'.

Next (chap. x) we come to the Seleucid Empire (including



## 22 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

the Maccabean episode). In its story the Seer had to face at least two serious difficulties. First, the close of this period (63 B.C.) did not seem to fall in with his scheme of 'months' (but see below). Secondly, it was in this period that the Jews, under the Maccabees, had abandoned the habit of submission and had seemed for a while to succeed by force. It would be hard to harmonize this story with the Seer's message of patience. No doubt such people as the Zealots appealed often to it in the generations that saw the Jewish outbreaks of 70 and 135 A.D. The Seer says that he has the key to all this, for there is the true account of it in a 'little book' that lies 'open' before him—but that he is forbidden to say what is in the 'little book'. But he does say one thing—he says that he was told to 'eat' this book and that it was 'sweet' to eat but 'bitter' to digest. This seems to point to the historic fact that the Maccabean period began with seeming success but ended in shame. As to the first difficulty named, the Seer perhaps makes no direct reference to the date of the end of the Second Woe, but, as we have seen, reckons the 'months' of the Second and Third Woes together, because too direct a reference to Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C. might give the Roman authorities, under whom he had already suffered in Patmos, a clue to the hidden meaning of his book. At the end of the article a further suggestion is made about this difficulty.

In the third paragraph (xi. 1-13) the Seer turns to the 'Second Temple', for the Temple was re-built at the beginning of the Persian Period. For his account of it, or rather of what it stood for 'spiritually' (cf. ver. 8), he uses a passage from the Book of Zechariah, a Prophet of this very Temple, who prophesied at the beginning of the Persian-Seleucid period. Having begun with this subject, he deals with it *to the end of the Third Woe* (ver. 3), carefully noting, however, that the Temple itself perished rather before this (ver. 2). He calls Zechariah's two 'sons of oil' God's 'two witnesses', but, though he connects them with the Temple, he does not call them priests but prophets. How could he call them 'priests' with the miserable story of the Priesthood for the past two centuries and more before him? What he means is that throughout



the Second and Third Woes there were a few in 'the holy city' who bore true witness. The Two Witnesses are 'clothed in sackcloth', for, like Ezra (Ezra ix.), they are penitents on behalf of their people. They seem feeble, but 'if any man desireth to hurt them' they can devour him with fire (ver. 5). This is probably a reference to the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes. The Two Witnesses have also power to command a drought (ver. 6), which may be a reference to the First Chapter of Haggai. As we have seen, they are connected with the Temple. Here the Seer tells that, like Ezekiel, he was commanded to measure the Temple, but, unlike Ezekiel, he found it to be quite small, for it has no 'outer court'. This last was *meant* to be a place where Gentiles could worship (cf. Mark xi. 17), but it *was* a place that Gentiles defiled. Indeed, the Gentiles are to 'tread underfoot the holy city' till 70 A.D. (ver. 2). It is clear that for the Seer the literal Temple is far less important than the truth for which, with all its shortcomings, it did to some degree stand. At xi. 7 he passes to describe the destiny of the Two Witnesses *after his own time*, and it will be best to take vers. 7-13 when we reach the rest of his anticipations of the immediate future. The phrase 'Where also their Lord was crucified', however, should be noticed here. The Seer says that the 'holy city' itself must needs be 'called spiritually' 'Sodom and Egypt', for far the major part of Judaism had apostatized, as Caiaphas and his minions showed once for all when they led 'the people' to cry out 'Crucify Him, Crucify Him'. Like Egypt, therefore, in the days of Moses, Jerusalem must be smitten; and like Sodom, in the days of Abraham, it must be destroyed.

The account of the Third Woe (63 B.C. to *ca.* 112 A.D.) is here taken to extend from xi. 14 to xx. 6. It is the Woe of the Dragons and Brutes. These have no exact pedigree, but they all belong to the same breed as the Old Serpent of Genesis. Wherever the phrase 'seven heads and ten horns' occurs, however, it is safe to 'spot' the Roman Empire or its embodiment in a Caesar. For reasons of space it is necessary here to deal, in the main, only with the passages that relate to dates and to the history of the times. For instance, for the 'war in heaven' (xii. 7) it must suffice to refer to the passages

## 24 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

about Michael in Daniel and Jude, and to those where Paul speaks of the 'heavenly (places)'—which are the *lower* 'heavens' where there is a 'prince of the power of the air', and where 'thrones, dominions, principalities and powers' throng.

In the first passage with a date (chap. xii) the Seer says that he is dealing with a phenomenon that lasted throughout his Seven Centuries (xii. 6). He speaks of a woman, whose counterpart or 'angel' or *genius* 'in heaven' is 'arrayed with' the sun and the moon and the stars. This is the 'true and faithful' Israel that had existed throughout the Period of Tribulation. On earth, however, she needs to flee more than once 'into the wilderness'. Here the Seer refers for the first time to the Jews in exile and their descendants in the Diaspora. As it has often been pointed out, it was among the exiles that the 'true and faithful' Israel had survived. For the Seer, therefore, in the lands of exile there was a 'place' where the true Israel was 'nourished', and which '*had been* prepared (not '*was* prepared') of God' for her from the first Destruction of Jerusalem onwards. When the Roman period began she was 'about to be delivered' of the Messiah Himself, and 'a great red dragon' waited to destroy her child. Indeed, under Pilate it seemed to have done this, but 'her child was caught up (not merely to the 'heavenly places', but) unto God and unto his throne'. Yet the Red Dragon still pursued the woman, standing 'upon the sand of the sea' and pouring out after her floods of its waters from his mouth, for she had fled again to her 'place of nourishment in the wilderness'. In other words, the Seer believed that the Christian Diaspora in his own time was organically one with the 'Jewish Church', the faithful Israel, of former days. Rome is attacking it in the Churches of Asia, and the attack comes from the West ('the sea').

The next passage (chap. xiii) tells of two Brutes. The first is the Roman Empire, and it is, at first sight, surprising to read that it was 'given authority *to do* (what it had a mind to do—cf. James iv. 13) for forty and *two* months' (i.e. till 70 A.D.), for, of course, the Roman power continued after that, and we should have expected 'forty and *five* months'. For the explanation we need to turn to a passage in the Book

of Daniel about 'a great warfare' (Daniel x. 1-xii. 4). Its message is not reached until we come to Daniel xi. 2. From that point to the middle of verse 27 there is a straightforward account of the history of Persia, of Alexander, and of the Seleucid rule as far as the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, which the Seer, with his knowledge of history, could not mistake, even though he thought that the Book of Daniel was written before, and not after, its events. In verse 27, however, he read that 'the *end* shall be at the time appointed'. For the Seer this would refer to the closing period of *his Seven Centuries*. In the verses that follow the phrase 'He shall do' occurs twice, and the Revised Version margin rightly suggests that in Revelations xiii. 5 the Seer is quoting this Danielic phrase. In the same verses in Daniel another phrase, 'He shall return', occurs five times, and it is quite possible that the Seer thought that Nero was Epiphanes *redivivus*. Now, in Daniel xii. 6 we read that 'One said to the man clothed in linen . . . How long shall it be to the *end* of these wonders?', and the answer is that it shall come when 'they have made an end of breaking in pieces the power of the holy people'—that is, for the Seer, 70 A.D. Probably he thought that, while Rome's power was to continue till *ca.* 112 A.D., her 'authority' after 70 A.D. was no longer 'given unto' her, but usurped.

The other Brute comes up 'out of the earth' (xiii. 11)—that is, from Asia. It is a horned lamb—that is, it looks feeble but it is really strong. It 'deceives them that dwell on the earth' and leads all mankind to worship the first Brute. This seems to refer to the fact that Caesar-worship began in Asia and was spreading, before the Seer's eyes, through the Roman Empire. At the end of the whole passage there comes, with the emphasis of 'here is wisdom', the reference to the 'number of the brute' (xiii. 18). Here this is taken to mean that the Seer says, in effect, 'Now mark what I say. We have reached the year 666 (78 A.D.) in the Period of Tribulation; in it the man whom we call "666" is returning'.

At this point we may turn to two other passages that seem to refer to Nero's return. In chapter xvii we read of Rome as 'a woman' who comes riding on the Brute of the Empire,

## 26 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

'drunken with the blood of the saints'. The last phrase seems to refer to the persecution under Nero, who is here regarded as a kind of epitome of his Empire and himself called 'the brute' (as in xiii. 18 and xvii. 11). He 'was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition' (xvii. 8, cf. ver. 11). This is, of course, to satirize him. He is a parody of God, 'which is, and which was, and which is to come'. In verse 9 the Seer again introduces an emphatic phrase, 'Here is the mind which hath wisdom', and he goes on to speak of 'seven kings', of whom 'five are fallen, the one is, the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a little while'. It is generally agreed that here the five are Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero—that the one who 'is' is Vespasian, and that by the seventh the Seer meant the 'weakly Titus'. This gives a date *ca.* 78 A.D. The Seer goes on to say that 'The brute that was, and is not, is himself also an eighth, and is of the seven; and he goeth into perdition.' This seems to mean that Nero is to return to reign again when Titus' reign is over. This, as is well known, tallies with the current 'heathen' idea that Nero had not really died but was in hiding somewhere in Asia. But does it completely tally with it, or does the Christian Seer expect that Nero, who *had* died, was to return from 'the abyss'? This is not impossible, for the Seer teaches that the martyred Meek are to return to earth in the 'first resurrection' (xx. 4, 6). This would mean that the Seer did not expect Domitian to reign after Titus, and suggests that he 'prophesied' *ca.* 78 A.D. and did not merely represent himself as doing so. Domitian could not have been 'Nero back again' *literally*, either from Hades or from hiding, for he was born seventeen years before Nero's death, and his whereabouts after that event were well known. The other relevant passage is xiii. 3, where one of the 'heads' of the Empire is said to have been 'slain unto death; and his death-stroke was healed'. Perhaps there is here by implication a satiric contrast between him and Jesus (cf. i. 18). The most natural meaning of the phrase seems to be that Nero had died—and had not merely been reputed dead. He is 'the brute that cometh up out of the abyss'. If, however, the Seer expected, not Nero himself, but another emperor of the

same type, there is no need to suppose that he had Domitian in mind, or indeed that he had already identified this 'second Nero' with any particular person. It is enough that he was sure that another 'terror' was on its way under another 'Nero'.

### III

After Chapter Thirteen we come to the record of the Seer's expectations *after* the date when he 'prophesied'. This is true even though, as we shall see, he refers indirectly to recent history. His anticipations were not *historically* realized by 112 A.D. None the less they embody *symbolically* great Christian truths. In particular, the Seer's account of the New Universe, with its capital the New Jerusalem (xx. 1-xxii. 5), is *the* classical account of the 'sure and certain hope' of Christians. Of the events that the Seer expected between his years 666 and 700 we may take first his account of the Two Witnesses (xi. 7-13), since this belongs to a date at least three and a half 'days' (years) before the second date (xi. 9). The power of 'the beast that cometh up out of the abyss' (cf. xvii. 8) still lasts, for it slays the Two Witnesses. In other words, the Seer expects Nero's second reign to last till *ca.* 112 A.D., and to be a time of persecution. The nations, who have so long been vexed by the invulnerability of the Witnesses (xi. 5), gloat over their unburied bodies for three and a half years (cf. Daniel vii. 25; ix. 27), but then they return to life and are 'called up' to heaven. This seems to mean that in the time of the Seer the 'testimony' of the 'saints' in Jerusalem was growing so feeble that he expected it soon to die out. This accords with his statement that the Church had now 'fled' to her 'place of nourishment' in the (Christian) Diaspora.

Of the Seer's account of the near catastrophe itself there are two records—a brief one (chap. xiv), and a longer one, under the series of Last Plagues. The two agree at their main points. It is important to notice that the Fall of *the city* of Rome and the conquest of her *Empire* are two separate events. To take the Fall of Rome first, several points should be noted. First, this is not ascribed to the armies led by 'one like unto a son of man'. Second, it is represented as happening 'in one hour' (xviii. 10, 17, 19)—that is, in a very short space

## 28 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

of time. Thirdly, the first five Plagues, like the Plagues of Egypt in Exodus, do not stand for the terrors of war but for *physical* 'visitations'. Under the Sixth Plague the Seer turns to the state of the Empire at large (which is considered below), but under the Seventh to Rome itself. Here there is, first, a great and world-wide earthquake, which, while it destroys other cities, breaks Rome from beneath into three fragments. The rendering 'The great city was divided into three parts' does no justice to the Greek phrase. Amid the universal earthquake 'Babylon' is now specially 'remembered in the sight of God'. As will presently appear, this seems to mean that the Seer expected that Rome would finally fall by a second and climacteric earthquake. If all these things are taken into account, it looks as if the Seer were thinking of the series of earthquakes that vexed the Bay of Naples with ever-increasing violence from 63 A.D. onwards. The inhabitants of Pompeii, for instance, kept on trying to rebuild their ruined city, but, when the famous eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. occurred, they had done no more than restore a single public building, the baths (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, arts. 'Pompeii' and 'Vesuvius'). The Seer seems to have expected that, after a first earthquake (xvi. 19), there would be 'one' other that would hurl all Rome into the sea (xviii. 21). In his description of the 'great city' he emphasizes her wealth and the 'merchants' that brought it (xviii. 3, 11-17). He also emphasizes the way in which the catastrophe would strike onlookers *from the sea* (xviii. 17-19). In other words, he looks at it with the eyes of the East, for almost all Rome's food, wealth and luxuries were brought from the East by sea. The common people on the shores of Roman Asia would have listened and listened and listened to returning 'mariners' as they told of earthquake after earthquake in the Bay of Naples. The Book of the Acts shows that they made port in the Bay (xxviii. 13; see art. 'Puteoli' in *H.D.B.*). Ships in port would sometimes sink when an earthquake tumbled the waters. It may be asked here whether, if the Seer had written *after* the fatal eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D., he would not have been likely at this point to use the imagery of 'fire from heaven' and from the 'pit' (cf. xx. 9, 14). It is true that he says



incidentally that the city was 'burning' (xvii. 16; xviii. 8f., 18; xix. 3), but this is what usually happens in cities after earthquake. Fires would be frequent in Pompeii throughout its earthquake years. Possibly, too, there may be a reference to the burning of Rome under Nero. The interval between the first and final earthquakes is to be filled with 'plagues and death and mourning and famine' (like the intervals at Pompeii), and is to last a year (xviii. 8).

Meanwhile any of the Meek who perish in Rome are 'blessed', for they 'rest from their labours', and, since their 'works do follow them', they will share in the coming triumph over the nations of the world, for they will then rise from the dead (xiv. 13; xx. 4-6). The Meek who do not perish with Rome are safe throughout the coming struggle between the nations and the armies of 'one like unto a son of man', for they are gathered under the aegis of the Lamb on Mount Zion (xiv. 1-5; cf. 2 Esdras ii. 42; Hebrews xii. 22). In a later passage 'Mount Zion' seems to be called 'the camp of the saints and the beloved city' (xx. 9). This seems to be a reference, by way of contrast, to the withdrawal of the Zealots to Jerusalem in 68 A.D. For, turning now to the Seer's account of the Conquest of *the Empire*, we find that he places the decisive battle in *Palestine*. Under the Sixth Plague (xvi. 12-16) the nations beyond the Euphrates (that is, of the Parthian Empire) find that the great river is 'dried up' and hurry to join the peoples of the Roman Empire at Har-Magedon. The river is dried up because God is drawing all the nations to their doom. The Seer has in mind the passage in the Book of Zechariah where the nations gather to attack Jerusalem, though he makes a different use of 'Megiddo' (Zechariah xii). The Pass of Megiddo was a critical point for any armies that were marching to attack Jerusalem from the East, for they regularly followed the great road that led along the Fertile Crescent through Esdraelon to Megiddo and beyond. As in Isaiah xiv. 13, 31, for instance, the 'Babylonian' terror comes upon Palestine from the North. Of course, this use of 'Mount Zion' and 'Har-Magedon' is a leading instance of the way in which Apocalyptic writers cross and re-cross the line that divides the literal from the symbolical without a

### 30 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

hint of hesitation. At xii. 16 the Seer leaves the nations mustered for their attack at Har-Magedon in order to describe the fate of the city of Rome itself, and he does not return to the War against the Nations till xix. 11. Here begins the victory of 'one like unto a son of man' (cf. xiv. 14). This phrase, of course, is quoted from Daniel's account of the ruler whose kingdom (which is also the kingdom of 'the saints of the Most High') is to be 'an everlasting kingdom' (Daniel vii. 27). The conqueror is not called the 'Lamb' because it is not now his patience that is in question. But he is called 'faithful and true', for he has now come to keep his word to the 'faithful and true'. The phrase 'dipped in blood', however, is probably a reference to the sufferings and death of the Lamb (cf. vii. 14). The name 'the Word of God' perhaps refers to a passage in the Book of Wisdom (xviii. 15ff.), where its author, describing the last Plague of Egypt, writes: 'Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of the royal throne, a stern warrior, into the midst of the destructive land.' The sense of 'all-powerful' is given by the mention of the conqueror's secret name, for among many peoples, then and now, it has been supposed (not altogether mistakenly) that to know a man's name is to have some hold upon him. Under the final name in the passage, 'King of Kings, and Lord of Lords', the writer as much as says 'Here, of course, I mean the Christ' (xvii. 14).

Presently the Seer returns to the muster at Har-Magedon (xix. 19). Here gather 'the brute, and the kings of the earth, and their armies'. The last previous reference to a 'brute' is in chapter xvii, where it is 'the brute . . . that cometh up out of the abyss' (xvii. 8), and this, as we have seen, is Nero. It seems to follow that, for the Seer, Nero was not in Rome when it fell, but at the head of the armies at Har-Magedon. Alike at Pharsalus, at Philippi, and at Actium, the fate of the Empire had been settled outside Italy. In the battle the Brute and 'the false prophet' are captured and flung into 'the lake of fire'. The Old Serpent, however, is dealt with separately (xx. 1-3), and it is he alone who is to be 'loosed out of prison' for the last struggle after the millennium (xx. 7). At Har-Magedon Nero is leading 'the kings of the whole earth' (xvi. 14), which include both the Parthian 'kings that

come from the sun-rising' (xvi. 12), who had not been subdued by Rome, and the 'kings' with whom the 'great harlot' had 'committed fornication' (xvii. 2; xviii. 3, 9f)—that is, the nations that Rome had conquered. It is noteworthy that the latter lament when Rome falls (xviii. 9f.). Possibly it is their Roman rulers (*legati*, etc.) who are called 'chiliarchs' (xix. 18), in a passage that recalls some verses in Ezekiel where the whole world gathers to fight against the Holy One of Israel (Ezekiel xxxix. 7, 17ff.). Are these Roman rulers (who recall such Provincial rulers as Galba, Otho, Vitellius and Vespasian, in Nero's first reign) the 'ten horns' of chapter xvii? There it is stated that they are 'kings' who have 'received no kingdom as yet' (i.e. in 78 A.D.), but are to be 'kings with the brute for one hour' (xvii. 12)—i.e. the new Nero will select his own brief 'chiliarchs'. The Battle in Palestine is perhaps supposed to take place *at the same time* as the Fall of Rome, for this too is fixed for 'one hour' (xviii. 10, 17, 19). This time the 'horns' (unlike Galba and the others in 68 A.D.) are 'of one mind', for God has given them this that He may destroy them together (xvii. 13, 17). Like Nero, the Brute, they 'hate the harlot' and plunder her (xvii. 16). This plundering is perhaps to be assigned to the year between the first and second earthquakes, and may recall the story that it was Nero who had burnt Rome. It is not clear whether the great battle is to be at Har-Magedon or on Mount Zion or somewhere between the two.

After the victory the Seer expects that there will be a 'first resurrection' and that the meek Lamb and the meek 'saints' will rule in a universal realm of peace for a thousand years. Here, as in refusing to be pseudepigraphic, he contrasts with the typical Apocalypticist. After the millennium there are to be a final conflict, the 'second (universal) resurrection', and the Judgement. The Seer, however, does not go into detail in describing any of these, but spends it upon the 'new Jerusalem'. Here, of course, there is an intentional contrast with Rome, previously described in detail. There is also some comparison with the old Jerusalem. For instance, in emphatic contrast with Ezekiel, the Seer declares 'I saw no temple therein'. Paradoxically, this amounts to saying 'I saw

## 32 THE THREE 'WOES' OF THE APOCALYPSE

nothing but temple therein', for the whole city, like the Holy of Holies, is to be a perfect cube (xxi. 16). In the epilogue (xxii. 6-21), as in the prologue (i-iii), the Seer, using his own name 'John', speaks *directly* to the Seven Churches. Here the repeated phrase 'I come quickly' refers, not to 'the end of the world', for this is more than a thousand years away, but to the events expected *ca.* 112 A.D. It is remarkable that the word 'Parousia' does not occur in this book.

It has been seen that the Seer's readers would already know that '666' meant Nero. Perhaps they knew too that by 'the brute that cometh up out of the abyss' the Seer also meant Nero, for where he first uses the phrase (xi. 7), he uses it without explanation. It is very unlikely that his readers had no earlier knowledge of Apocalyptic. He calls his book a 'prophecy' and implies that he himself was a 'prophet' (xxii. 9, 19). It looks as if he were one of the First Century 'prophets' who passed from church to church with their 'witness'. He was not only known to the Seven Churches but writes as one whose word was authoritative there. He had suffered in Patmos for Christ's sake. This implies that the Roman State had taken action against him, perhaps for refusing to 'worship the brute' at such a place as Pergamum, where 'Satan's throne' was. Was he now enlarging at length upon a message that he had previously been giving, piece by piece at different churches, by word of mouth? It may be added that, while *circa* has usually been prefixed to dates given above, the Seer seems to have thought that the first Babylon destroyed Jerusalem precisely in 588 B.C., for otherwise, on his figures, the Roman destruction would not have taken place precisely in 70 A.D., and it is likely that here he would know the exact date. Modern scholars tend to date the first destruction in 587 or 586 B.C., but, when it is remembered that the Jews had no exact chronology for the period after the Monarchy (cf. Daniel ix. 24ff.), there is nothing remarkable in the Seer's small error. It may be noted that, on this showing, the Third Woe covered exactly a quarter of the Seven Centuries, and that, if they are divided into ten seventy-year periods, one of these would fall to the First Woe, six and a half to the Second, and two and a half to the Third. The Seer may have

noticed this (x. 2, 8f.). Happily his glory does not lie in his arithmetic, for, of course, when the year A.D. 112 came, it altogether disappointed his expectations.

If this exposition of the Three Woes were accepted, it would, of course, raise the question of the exposition of iv. 1-viii. 12. There is not space here to discuss this, but it would seem to follow that the 'book with seven seals' (chap. v) is to be identified with the 'book' that Daniel was bidden to seal 'even to the time of the end' (Daniel xii. 4, 9). At long last the Lamb unseals the Secret of the Seven Centuries. He has and is the key to the suffering of all the 'saints'. Here there is a truth that has nothing to do with arithmetic.

C. RYDER SMITH

## HAVE THE VALUES A VALUE FOR ETHICS?

### I

VALUE is one of the last great philosophic topics to have received recognition. Its discovery was probably the greatest philosophical achievement of the nineteenth century. But opinion on the subject has not yet crystallized, and it is still one of the growing points of philosophy and one which seems likely to overshadow other issues.' These words of F. C. S. Schiller, written in 1920, will serve to remind us, not only of the recent appearance of the topic of values in the philosophical field, but also of the successful way in which it has made itself at home there in the twenty years since Schiller wrote his brief article in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Professor Sorley had already delivered his important Gifford Lectures on *Moral Values and the Idea of God* (1914, 1915), which themselves followed on two volumes by Bernard Bosanquet (*The Principle of Individuality and Value*, 1912, and *The Value and Destiny of the Individual*, 1913). In 1929 appeared Professor John Laird's *Idea of Value*, and in 1933 the late Professor Alexander's *Beauty and Other Forms of Value*.

There are many other recent books which constantly

touch the subject and even revolve around it, such as *The Meaning of Meaning* (Ogden and Richards, 1927), Richards' *Principles of Literary Criticism* (1928), and Bertrand Russell's *Enquiry into Meaning and Truth* (1940); and from the pages of the philosophical journals the subject is rarely absent. Indeed, everyone regards himself as having free entrance into this wood, whether he enters by a gate or over the fence. Very often he is travelling farther on; and it is just as well that travellers should decide on the path to be taken; for it would appear that but few are agreed as to the name of the wood, or, to drop the metaphor, as to the meaning of the term value, or its value to them or to others.

The real difficulty is that there are so many trees in the wood. Everything that matters to us may be said to have its value, or disvalue. Value would seem to include all personal or individual preferences, many of them based on no known or intelligible reason. And no one can construct a science out of individual instances. Yet these preferences, the despair of the scientific mind, may act as sign-posts to something else. Granted that the actual types of things which men strive for or select or buy are as many as the sands on the shore, may there not be some principle of value, some divine surge of nostalgia, or some centre of attraction, which draws men to pursue it by many paths, as the moon exerts her single force on the waters of the earth, though the shores on which the tides ebb and flow face north, south, east, and west? Should this be so (and if it is not so, all talk of value would be sterile and useless), there may be some essential value which rises to conscious experience, even in the satisfaction of having a well-stocked wine-cellar or of being perfectly well-dressed.

## II

Value, says Bosanquet, lies in 'what is alive and comes of itself, the whole object which calls out the whole mind; in a word, what satisfies'. Yet who has ever known such satisfaction? For the perfectly unified life would seem to be the life beyond which one does not need to look. But only as we are allowed a *plus ultra* can there be real satisfaction. The whole



must cease to be the whole. Paradox as it sounds, satisfaction and yearning march side by side. It is

Those obstinate questionings  
Of sense and outward things;  
Fallings from us, vanishings,  
High instincts before which our mortal nature  
Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised,

which are the fountain light of all our day. We may say that we value this or that, the Ming vase, the applause that greets a superb speech, or the chain of office; but the heart and essence of what we value is neither what we can acquire nor what we or anyone else can make. They are no gods made with hands that we worship. We must pass outside ourselves to something which exists apart not only from ourselves but from all mankind; which was before them and will remain when they are gone; from which they may turn away, and to which they can always in humility draw near.

To such an interpretation of value the religiously-minded man will naturally be attracted, even more than to the three Values, goodness, truth and beauty, which, he is so often told, are manifestations and embodiments of God. He is familiar with objects of adoration that exist in every age and clime; 'Jehovah, Jove, or Lord'. He calls them God; and to God, so understood, the world of values seems so closely akin that each will lend and gain support through the other. He may hesitate as to the precise relation in which the values stand to God; and Dr. Inge will not give him as much help as he might desire. 'The path', he writes, 'from the appreciation of the good, the true and the beautiful, to the recognition of their source in the supreme Being, is rather of the nature of a solid inference.' But for the bulk of us, though value may be one, the values are many; and we have constantly to weigh them up against each other. 'I value freedom', a man will say, 'above comfort'; or 'I would rather die than endure the agonies of cancer.' But this does not tell us what it is that he really values. What is that treasure in which freedom is richer than comfort?

### III

Most of us probably never ask the question. Pleasure, as

we anticipate it, is to most men an unerring light, and liking its own security. This, however, would be more satisfactory if we did not so often make mistakes. It is a foolish and graceless thing to tease your little Edward into telling you why he would rather be at Kilve than at Liswyn Farm. Yet there is undoubtedly a reason, even though, as our psychologists remind us, it may be half-buried in the debatable territory between the conscious and the unconscious; it may even be something never to be confessed to others or even to ourselves.

But perhaps after all there is no one thing that we can be said to value. Each of us has a host of likes and dislikes, for which he can give no more account than for his attitude to Dr. Fell, yet in whose making everything in his past life and experience and in that of his parents and ancestors has had its part. To say this is not to forget the gap which separates what are known as primary and secondary and even tertiary values; things which we value for themselves, and things which help us, directly or indirectly, to attain them. But this only means that if few of us are wholly integrated (to have 'one aim, one object, one desire'), few are as disintegrated as they imagine or appear. If we simply attached our labels, 'I like this', 'I do not like that', to the various objects before us as if they had no connection with one another, there would be an end to any intelligent conception of another's character or conduct. As a matter of fact, we can often predict a friend's conduct more confidently than he can himself. While he is deliberating, we are pretty sure of what the verdict will be. Nor is that because we attribute to his acts something of the uniformity of natural law, or ally ourselves with the heresy of the behaviourists. It is not because we suppose that what has happened once must happen again. It is because, as we say, he is the sort of man who will prize this—freedom, for example, and reject the alternative—comfort or security.

#### IV

In saying this, we may be conscious that he differs from ourselves. Perhaps we envy him for claspings to his breast

what we can only salute from afar. Perhaps we wish that he loved what we love; we resent the virtue that would deny the rest of us our cakes and ale; or possibly we are aware that both of us might place our affections on some worthier object. But at the moment we are psychologists; we must not allow ethical questions to distract us. A more important point for us is this. We have asked whether we really value one thing or many. We have also to ask whether, when we say 'we', each of us thinks of himself as an individual in a crowd, distinct from the others ('I value this, you that, and he something else'), or as a group, whose likes and dislikes are held in common. Is a value, that is, something which, being itself one, gives unity to the individual and to the human race?

We have none of us any direct knowledge or immediate experience of the human race. All we can do is to observe ourselves, tracing as far as we can the connection between bodily changes or events and our mental life with its three inseparable factors of knowing, feeling, and desiring; and then looking at others, watching them as we are forced to do from the outside, and comparing what they say or do with what we might have said or done in similar circumstances.

At first, we are baffled by the multiplicity of our own desires and those of other people. But if we keep our heads, we shall find that anything we say we like is connected with some particular fact of experience; the satisfaction of some physical sense, the consciousness of a diffused harmony in body and perhaps in mind; when there is no discomfort to disturb the equilibrium; the joy of having overcome some obstacle or of being on the way to overcome it; of drinking delight of battle with our peers; of being perfectly at home in the place in which we find ourselves; or, of being able to give complete employment to the powers of which, fully or only in part, we are aware. We speak of equilibrium; but it is an equilibrium unknown to the physicist. It may indeed be the calm of

The memory like a cloudless air,  
The conscience as a sea at rest.

But it may be beaten out in the fiercest activity of the football field, the wrestling ground, the prize-ring, the last couloir of an Alpine height, or the immeasurable and pitiless snows of the

Antarctic. One will know it in the fervour or the fury of the artist, seized in the rage of creation; another, perhaps, in struggling with the angel at the brook Jabbok. Like Henry V before Agincourt, a man may face the most pregnant issues with a lover's happiness.

## V

Now, in face of all this, is there one value or half a dozen? There is really only one. We may take as its formula, 'finding ourselves perfectly adequate to the situation'. The situation will vary from moment to moment. Now it will be access to sufficient food and drink of the right quality; now, all the furniture of a palace of art; now, riding in the triumphal chariot up the Sacred Way to the Capitol; now, sporting with Amaryllis in the shade; now, mounting

With Plato to the empyreal sphere,  
To the first good, first perfect, and first fair,

and now refusing to come down from the cross while all the trumpets of twelve legions of angels prepare themselves to sound.

The situations change. Some we adapt to our liking; to others we have to adapt ourselves. In most of them we have to feel our way. But we know and treasure up for future use the difference between adequacy and inadequacy. Moreover, because situations change, we can constantly make discoveries. In some of them we can attain a greater sense of adequacy than in others; or the adequacy which once we felt turns out to be pitifully inadequate. The youth of twenty may be all for wine and song; at twenty-five he may plunge into the great game of money-making, or take the first steps in a parliamentary career. The glorious struggles on the school playing-fields are a mere waste of time to the eager young lawyer; or, like another Childe Harold, he may lose the old values and never find the new.

There are many values, then; but there is one value. This is as true for mankind as for the individual. When we watch others, what do we find? That they act as if they knew as much of satisfaction and dissatisfaction as we do; that they come upon both by quite diverse routes; but that what they

welcome is an experience in which they can continue unhindered and victorious; a situation to which they too feel themselves adequate. Yet here we may easily go wrong. 'Unhindered', yes; but—continuous? For how long? The very activity that satisfies us completely for the moment would terrify us if we had to contemplate its continuance till tomorrow. The old Cyrenaic philosophers may have overshot the mark with their ideal of the pleasure of the full-blooded moment; but how many men would be content with the satisfaction that could only be enjoyed in a complete and mature life? Better, they would say, one crowded hour, and even one radiant minute. We agree. This, however, is not to contradict but to enlarge our previous conclusion. For the triumphant moment cannot be thought of by itself. It is a climax, a culmination. The hours, the years of preparation that have preceded it, are part of the action of which it is the visible crown. Nor is the action then at an end. The achievement becomes the step to a further advance. What a man really values is neither reaching the goal nor travelling hopefully. Each turn of the road that is reached is a goal; each goal is a fresh start. The attainment of every means is an end; every end is a new and promising means. Adequacy to the situation, when the genuine wine of life mantles in the cup, is the power to turn means into ends, ends into means, and to welcome and rejoice in both.

How far does this take us? Have we gone beyond the lame conclusion that we value what satisfies us; that we like what we do not happen to dislike? We have at least found that the individual is more than a bundle of preferences, tied together like faggots by a string. Humanity itself is animated by a common desire; a desire that may be fulfilled along such different roads that those who run and those who watch may think it not one but many. We have spoken of it as an experience and an action. It is both. The two cannot be distinguished. There could be no action unless it were felt to involve or to induce an experience that would be welcome. And no experience can be welcome, for more than the briefest interval, that is merely passive. Adequacy to the situation secures for us the one and the other.

## VI

Still more important, this view opens the door for those ethical considerations which hitherto we have neglected. To the psychologist one experience of value is no more and no less interesting than another; and no more and no less important. All the psychologist has to do is to note how the sense of value grows, why it attaches itself to this experience or that, how far we can control our scheme of values and how far it creates itself, so to speak, out of the past history of our interests and habits, our bodily organism and our environment. For the psychologist, the words higher and lower have no meaning. Yet they have for the rest of us, and for the psychologist himself when he is not psychologizing. Whether by instinct or reasoned conviction, we persist in feeling that some values ought to be pursued and others shunned. Indeed, if morality decides, as it certainly does, that some values are immoral, then for moral persons they cease to be values altogether. It is conceivable that in the world of morals neither truth nor beauty might remain as values.

If we prefer, more correctly, to speak of one value, pursued by various paths, we are simply asserting that some of these paths are to be preferred to others. But on what ground can we do this? If it is a law of man's being, and therefore beyond his own control, that he should value supremely a condition of harmony between himself and his surroundings—or, to put it in another way, if it is the law that *omnis creatura in suo esse persistit*, that all things conserve their own existence to the highest point in their power—can we venture to interfere with the way in which he accomplishes it? But whether this is justifiable or not, it is constantly attempted. Society leaves no one alone. Some ways to value it peremptorily closes; others it recommends with more or less of authority and force. It has all Bentham's 'sanctions' behind it, 'political', 'moral or popular', and 'religious', as well as 'physical'. If the natural desire to be ourselves and different from everyone else breeds in us at times a spirit of revolt that bids us travel our own way and let the world go to the devil, the equally natural inclination to like what others like, to imitate what others are doing, to feel at home with the familiar and to admire it, and to con-



demn and loathe the strange, furnishes us with a scale of preferences; and it is but a step to range them as higher and lower, more and less worthy.

Indeed, society has been quick to go further; and the man who learnt as a child that to be 'naughty' means doing what older people do not like, now finds that what is not usually done is wrong or bad. Even this, however, does not take us beyond the realm of the psychologist. It simply shows us why certain values are condemned or praised. It fails to do even as much as that for society. 'That is a lower value; we dislike it,' says society to the individual. 'Very well; so do I,' is the answer. 'But why do you dislike it?' To assign the reason would be to write the sociological history of the society in question, and to show how certain customs, habits, cultural practices, methods of work and play, were felt to provide the sum of adequacy and harmony which all desire.

## VII

In addition to all this, every society has possessed the categories of good and bad, and has persisted in placing the actions of its members in one or other of them. The reasons need not concern us now. In fact, they must not; for we cannot assign them. To fight to the death with Leonidas in the Pass of Thermopylae, to fetch water for the beloved king from the well at Bethlehem, to leap into the water, like Meredith's Beauchamp, to save the life of a wastrel—who can say why our hearts leap up when we behold these triumphs of human virtue? Are we influenced by memories of those whom we once admired? By a vague sense that we shall all somehow be the better for it? By the movement of hormones within the blood, or the influence of conditioned reflexes? By the desire for posthumous praise (as if we should somewhere be listening to it), or the pride of going down with flags flying and drums beating? Who can say? There may once have been a reason—a good one or a bad—why courage was praised and treachery condemned; the point is that we do not trouble about a reason now, any more than about the reason for preferring the sense of a full stomach to an empty one, or the wind on a grassy hillside to the reek of a fever-haunted jungle.

## 42 HAVE THE VALUES A VALUE FOR ETHICS?

The time has come when psychology must learn not to press beyond its mark. It is not for psychology to ask how far biochemistry is responsible for aesthetic or moral approbation, or whether it can be allowed to pass from the reactions of canine saliva to the pride of a Coriolanus or the passionate selflessness of a Desdemona. Psychology has done its work when it has shown us how deep-seated are these admirations, how cowardly our disloyalties to them, how diverse their objects. For we live by admiration, hope, and love; whether our ideal is a Kosciusko, a Schleicher or some leader of the bloodthirsty cult of the Thugs. It is for ethics to pronounce 'this we ought to admire, that we ought to loathe'; but after that it will still be left for psychology to inquire how admiration and imitation may be led or enticed from one field to the other.

### VIII

There is no ethical doctrine of values. Ethics assumes values, as it used to assume springs of action, worked out so carefully, for example, in Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*; and it arranges them according to standards of its own. The doctrine of values traces their growth and development, but cares nothing for their respectability. Ethics cares nothing for their growth, but everything for their claim to honour or homage. If values were no more, the standards of Ethics would remain; but Ethics itself would grow feeble and perplexed, for morality would wilt and pine. At their worst, the things men value all but make us despair of human nature. At their best, they rebuke our sluggishness and coarseness. They jolt us out of our grooves, our complacency. It is as if we had to do with a person, ever summoning us to what is too high for us, and yet to what was made for us as we for it. Reaching up to it, we fulfil ourselves; we become adequate to the most real and abiding of all situations. And the religious man is equally in need of the values. For the values make up something which forms part of our highest thought of God, when we know that we are His creation, and therefore are ourselves creators. And it is in the sense of unconditional value that the saint finds his bliss; when, for example, he prays

Kindle a flame of sacred love  
On the mean altar of my heart;

or—

This sanctuary of my soul  
Unwitting I keep white and whole,  
Unlatched and lit, if Thou shouldst care  
To enter or to tarry there.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

### THE USE OF THE WORD 'CONVERSION'

TO some readers a discussion of the meaning of the term conversion may appear almost frivolous in view of the world's need; others may feel that any criticism of this term is treason against the Gospel. Further consideration, however, may convince us both of the importance of all the words we use and of the need to clarify this word in particular. If it does indeed please God through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe, how necessary it is that the language of the preacher should be neither ambiguous nor needlessly insufficient! It is the purpose of this article to suggest that the word conversion is used both ambiguously and in ways which are often seriously inadequate, and that these faults are to be found both in theological writing and in preaching. Let it be made clear, however, that it is not part of our task to question the importance of any one of the meanings that are now given to this word. When a warm-hearted Christian exclaims: 'What we need are more conversions!' what does he imply? Does he refer to his desire to see more frequent visible response to pulpit-appeals, or to the need for more people to begin to live a life that is hid with Christ in God, or to the necessity for a more fully developed Christian faith and life? Any and all of these results are highly to be desired, but they cannot, or should not, all be described by the one term. It is, then, only from concern for the realization of the hopes of those who use this word most frequently and, as will be argued, most vaguely, that this discussion is attempted.

## I

We must begin with the New Testament background to the word conversion. It need not be stressed that this background is very slight. Strictly speaking, the word 'conversion' is not a New Testament term; in varied forms it is found a few times as an English translation of a Greek word meaning 'to turn' and of its compounds. Once only is the noun 'conversion' employed (Acts xv. 3: 'The conversion of the Gentiles'). In four places the verb is used for 'turn again' in the quotation from Isaiah vi. 10. James v. 19f. provides the solitary and precarious justification for the phrase, now sometimes used, 'my converts'. The remaining instances are (a) for 'turn about' (Luke xxii. 32: 'when thou art converted', and Acts iii. 19: 'Repent ye therefore, and be converted'), and (b) for 'turn' (Matthew xviii. 3: 'Except ye be converted and become as little children'). Most of these translations were altered in the Revised Version. Nowhere—in Christ's own teaching, in Evangelist's comment or in Apostle's exposition—do we find (even in translation) this word used as part of one of the great descriptions of the Work of Divine Grace in human souls. Yet this is the word which, as we shall note, is employed even by reputable theologians to summarize the whole of that Work.

An hour spent in a library with the Indexes to classical books of Christian Theology will serve to show how slightly this word has been used in them. It may, however, be claimed that it is all-important for evangelical preaching and especially for Methodist preaching. Let us, therefore, glance at John Wesley. It was because he was essentially Scriptural in his teaching that he did not readily employ a term which has scant authority in the New Testament. This fact is often forgotten by those who almost claim 'conversion' as a Methodist possession—a claim equally unfair to Wesley and to other Christians. Wesley explicitly said that conversion was 'a term, indeed, which I rarely use, because it rarely occurs in the New Testament'. [Letter to Bishop Lavington.] The word is strikingly absent from his Sermons, even from such sermons as 39 (The New Birth) and 2 (The Almost Christian). We certainly find the verb 'convert' not infrequently in the Wesley hymns, to

which reference will be made later; and there are, of course, repeated references to sudden conversion in the Journal. That a man could suddenly and clearly know his sins forgiven and the new life begun was a truth which Wesley long doubted, came to experience for himself, and ever delighted to witness, to record and to preach. The fact that he deliberately avoided the use of this term may of itself provide justification for our inquiry.

## II

Having seen that both the New Testament and the work of one great evangelist cast doubts upon the adequacy of the word we are considering, let us now notice two major ambiguities in contemporary usage. The first concerns the human and the Divine aspects of Christian experience; the second ambiguity is between the initial stage and the continuous development of that experience.

1. There can be no doubt that most of those who use the word conversion intend reference to God's work in the human soul. That is so even when they speak of 'my converts', and perhaps even when they give to the Sunday on which they hope for youthful conversions the name of Decision Day. Some, however, define the word in terms which lay all the stress upon the act of the human will. For example, in a *Manual of Pastoral Psychology* we read of 'The processes of conversion, or spiritual education', and are told that 'Conversion means the repeated and continuous direction towards God of all the elements of our psychical life.' [Dewar and Hudson, page 98.] There is both a human and a Divine side to all religious experience; we are taught that we must be born again, but also we are bidden to turn and become as little children. Man's response and God's act are necessary parts of salvation. I believe that obscurity is often caused in this respect by the use of the word conversion. The effects of this obscurity differ; some people substitute 'decision', 'surrender', 'making up the mind', 'giving oneself to God', for the crisis of spiritual rebirth; others wait helplessly for 'something' to happen and seek blindly for a particular 'feeling' about which they have heard. Either result is disastrous.

It is significant that in the New Testament, when this word is found in English translation, it refers to the human aspect rather than to the divine, as, indeed, we should expect when we recall that it translates words meaning 'to turn'. It is, however, exactly in the opposite sense that we find it employed, for example, in the Wesley Hymns. Here the word is used for the work of God Himself, contrasted with anything that man can do ('My soul to Thee convert . . .', 'Me Thou dost labour to convert', 'Mine inmost soul convert', etc.). Of course, both the Scriptural and Hymnal uses express deep truths ('Work out your own salvation, for it is God that worketh in you'); but the truths may be, and I believe often are, hidden by the exclusive use of the word conversion.

2. When we turn to the second ambiguity we reach even more important matters and come within the realm of theological writing. What does 'conversion' mean? We ought to be able to give a clear answer to that question, but can we do so when we find the word sometimes describing the first turning to God (conceived either as a sudden change or as 'gradual'), and sometimes covering the whole of the Christian experience, including Regeneration, Justification and Sanctification as well as repentance and faith?

In earlier Methodist teaching we do not find this ambiguity. The older Methodist Catechisms defined conversion as 'the turning to God in repentance and faith'. (In the latest Catechism there is no reference to the word; but this is not the only strange omission in that production!) W. B. Pope gave a clear account of this word and of its limitations:

'Conversion is the process by which the soul turns, or is turned from sin to God, in order to its acceptance through faith in Christ. This is its strict meaning, as distinguished from the broader sense in which it is applied to the entire history of the soul's salvation.' 'Sometimes, by a very loose employment of the term, it is made synonymous with the experience of forgiveness and the assurance of reconciliation. But we must remember it simply means the turning point of the religious life. . . . Conversion belongs, therefore, only to the outer court of the Christian temple'. [*A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 2nd edit., vol. 2, pp. 367f.]

It is for the return of this word to its valuable place in the outer court of the Christian temple that this article pleads.



It is not in this place that we find it to-day. Of that fact two examples may be given.

The first is from an Anglican writer. The Rev. Alec Vidler, in the highly successful addresses which he gave in Oxford University and which were published under the title *God's Demand and Man's Response*, describes Christian Conversion as 'a process, a life-long process. It is not a sudden event that can be finished and done with. It is a gradual transformation of personality through the love of God in Christ. For many the process does begin with an apparently sudden realization of the claims and love of Christ; that is what is called "sudden" conversion'. He also refers to 'this initial experience we call conversion in the narrower sense' as 'this self-decision, this self-commitment' (page 81). In this passage we seem to find most of the varied uses of the term and, it seems to me, that the attempt to clarify them only serves to show the dangers inherent in the word.

Our other illustration is taken from a standard Methodist work, Dr. H. M. Hughes' *Christian Foundations*. Chapter ix of this book, 'The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Individual', arranges the whole of that Work under the heading of Conversion ('The Human Side of Conversion', 'The Divine Side of Conversion', 'The Consequences of Conversion'). It need not be stated in this Journal that Dr. Hughes dealt in this chapter with all the chief Scriptural words which belong to these sub-headings. The fact remains that we have here an extension of the term conversion to cover the whole of Salvation.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, at the beginning of the same chapter we read: 'The psychological process through which a man passes when he experiences salvation is often called Conversion.' And on the next page: 'Conversion takes place when psychological processes [of a kind previously and subsequently described] are brought to a head and the great act of surrender to Jesus

<sup>1</sup> I wrote to Dr. Hughes on this matter shortly before his death and received a reply from which, by permission of his family, I may quote. Referring to his use of 'conversion for the whole process of salvation', Dr. Hughes wrote: 'It is used very widely in that way to-day, but, though convenient, I agree that it is too loose when you get to grips with the subject. In my youth it used to be said that Conversion represents the human side, Regeneration the Divine side. Certainly the use of conversion only is apt to obscure the need for Re-birth.'—In reply to a further query *re* the word 'salvation', Dr. Hughes added: 'I do not think it is too late to redeem the word. To do this we must lay at least as much emphasis on salvation *into*, as upon salvation *from*.'

## 48 THE USE OF THE WORD 'CONVERSION'

Christ is made.' Here conversion seems to be the prelude to salvation, so that the word appears to be used both in the narrower and in the wider senses.

I may add, as an illustration of the confusion which has grown amongst Church members, that when I was reading Mr. Harold Beales' *Children of God* with a group of Methodist students, their understanding of his first excellent chapter—an exposition of the old definition of Conversion as 'turning to God in repentance and faith'—their understanding of these pages was hindered by preconceived notions. These were, on the one hand an idea that conversion is necessarily sudden and involuntary, on the other hand a somewhat vague conception that it should include the full developments of Christian experience.

### III

We have noted that conversion is not a key-word of the New Testament and that it is not an essential word in the history of evangelical teaching. We have further seen that there are serious ambiguities in its present-day usage. We must also remark that it is not a distinctively Christian word.

The need for words that are, so to speak, earmarked for Christian use may not be universally admitted; much is said about the necessity to translate the Gospel into the language of our day. Yet every preacher must recognize that if he is to proclaim a unique message he must sometimes employ unique words. Even familiar terms—such as love, joy, peace, hope—must be given their Christian content if the speaker is not to mislead or to be misunderstood. I have argued elsewhere that we ought not to imagine that a modern congregation is incapable of coming to understand the few technical words in the New Testament. 'Conversion' is not a specifically Christian word, nor is the experience of conversion necessarily religious. (Wilfrid Moulton once told me that he had been twice converted suddenly—once to Browning and once to mathematics.) Moreover, the fact that psychological study, initiated by William James, greatly increased the vogue of this word may be a further objection to much of the use that is now made of it. A psychological study of conversion-experiences is

valuable, but it is no substitute for theology. However interested people may be in a study of their psychological processes, it is not to this that we must turn their attention if they are to be 'saved'. Indeed, a desire for particularly exciting experiences and for feelings of a specific type may be, and in personal interviews has often proved to be, a serious hindrance to true spiritual growth. I am compelled to urge that the modern hearer does not always think about the most important aspects of the Christian Gospel when he hears fervent references to conversion.

## IV

In the light of these considerations I would offer a few conclusions for more competent consideration.

1. The term conversion should be reserved for the initial stage of the experience of salvation, the turning (and being turned) to God in repentance and faith.

Great will be the need for this word with reference both to those who have never heard of Christ and to those who have never known Him as Saviour. We may well be reminded that, in this sense, 'we need more conversions'. There seems, however, to be little significance in the word thus used unless it applies to an experience which, from the point of view of consciousness, takes place at a fixed time. The phrase 'gradual conversion' leads to endless misunderstanding; in one sense all conversion is gradual, in another it is just the suddenness of awareness which constitutes a conversion. Whether every man ought to experience a sudden change is a question into which we cannot enter here; it is obviously one of great importance and there seem to be somewhat serious differences of conviction amongst us. Whatever be the answer to that question, there is equal reason for reserving a special term for this sudden 'turn about'—so long as we leave room for further apprehensions of Divine Grace and for the 'turning again' of 'backsliders'.

2. When the term conversion is used in the above way, care must be taken to refer both to the human and to the Divine aspects. The human will must be aroused, but never to the point of substituting decision or resolve for Grace; the un-

merited Giving of God must be taught, without the errors inherent in Quietism.

3. There is great need for a re-teaching of the many truths contained in the New Testament picture of Salvation and of the many words used to describe it. If we are again urging people to read the Bible, we should not allow them to discover therein central doctrines about which they have never heard. Can we be content that a large proportion even of our existing congregations knows little about such phrases as Justification by Faith and the Witness of the Spirit?

4. The noun 'Salvation' and the verb 'to save' need to be recaptured for the Christian vocabulary. No longer should we be intimidated, by the spectre of 'hell-fire preaching', from offering explicitly, free, full salvation through Jesus Christ. We need not be ashamed of the question 'Are you being saved?' Nor should we cease to expect that many will suddenly be converted to accept salvation.

FREDERIC GREEVES

### THE SPIRIT OF WORSHIP IN THE SCHOOL

**I**N a recent *Christian Newsletter* T. S. Eliot sets out Wisdom and Holiness as the aims of a Christian Education: 'For', he says, 'our tendency has been to identify wisdom with knowledge, saintliness with natural goodness, to minimize not only the operation of Grace but self-training, to divorce holiness from education. Education has come to mean education of the mind; an education of the mind can only lead to scholarship, to efficiency, to worldly achievement and power, but not to wisdom.'

Wisdom and Holiness are the fruits of worship. Wisdom grows in the contemplation of the meaning and purpose of life, to the Christian this is contemplation of the will of God. The word 'contemplation' gives, perhaps, too great a value to the human and intellectual side of what is really a personal relationship with God involving our whole selves and His whole Self. Strictly speaking contemplation may produce the philosopher, it may not produce the man of God. Worship is

'to the Greeks foolishness' because it begins at the end and simply accepts God. It blends the emotional and the intellectual, it is divine and human, it is of 'grace' and 'self-training'. Primarily it is 'the wisdom that is from above'. So 'if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given to him.' The condition is acceptance.

Holiness is another product of worship. 'Be ye holy as I am holy.' God is like us in many ways. Jesus has taught us to think of God in terms of the best human relationships. He behaves like the best of people—He is our Father. Hosea and others think of him as the Husband of His people. The Church is the Bride of Christ. But on the other hand, 'as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.' This otherness is the chief characteristic of holiness. Holiness is communicated to those people and things associated with the 'holy other'. Worshipers become in their own degree holy. They have no abiding city here, they seek a city whose maker and builder is God. They become otherworldly in the sense that time and space for them only exist as part of the eternal order. They hear and obey the word: 'Come ye out and be ye separate and touch not the unclean thing.' Fellowship with God in worship is eternal life now.

In the present ordering of society there is little time for worship—the growth of wisdom and holiness. Indeed Mr. Middleton Murry traces our present calamities in part to the fact that the human mind cannot keep pace with the increased tempo of events, and failing to digest their significance it has to be content with accepting the dictatorship of events and surrenders its right to shape events. He would probably agree that even if the tempo of events has increased to a maddening degree yet the mind could do something to grasp their significance if it were disciplined by worship to seek the voice of God in events. The social environment with its crushing pressure on the school has brought the same increased tempo into the curriculum and in the average school there is little time for wisdom and holiness. These qualities require time. We may, with a new technique, force facts on the memory and

cram the brain with knowledge just as we can force-feed chickens; in the jargon of machine religion we may be 'saved' in the twinkling of an eye; but this wisdom and holiness come in the 'slow watches of the night'.

Leaving the matter of re-ordering of the curriculum aside for present purposes the question we as teachers must face is—what can we do now to encourage a real spirit of worship in the school? Much of Christian education is informal and unconscious, depending on the basic assumptions of the school community in which it is carried on. We can therefore profitably focus attention on the relationship of the persons in the community to God and to one another. To be realistic, we are compelled to work to an examination curriculum and this is not a bad check on teachers who are preparing pupils for an imperfect society. It is assumed that we are primarily concerned with the specially Christian values and only in the second place with examination.

The immediate practical issue, then, is to see how we may increase activities which create or encourage the spirit of worship—activities, mental, physical, and spiritual. Paradoxically this may mean increasing the facilities to be idle, in the sense of doing nothing that people can see, doing nothing to produce £ s. d., or scholarships. In other words, giving Mary a chance to teach for a time and giving Martha a much-needed holiday and an opportunity to find out the one thing that is needful.

Worship presupposes the emotion of reverence, which is compounded of many primary emotions such as fear, awe, wonder, and love. To increase the opportunity for developing these emotions is to increase the child's power to enter into the 'meaning' and experience of worship. Mystery is an important element in worship. For the child the world is full of wonder and mystery. When we cease to ask, why? then Jesus says to us: 'Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of heaven.' As it is, we often educate the sense of wonder out of children. They are led to believe that there is no mystery in life that man cannot probe and lay bare, no God that the scientists cannot analyse, no holy of holies inaccessible to the abomina-



tion of desolation with his test-tube and microscope. Clearly it is right to investigate everything and Christianity does not shrink from the boldest inquiry. Yet the competent scientist knows that he is dealing with a mystery, and however far he goes he is still dealing with ways that are past finding out. In the limited researches of the school this is not made clear, and the nineteenth-century assumption that man is the captain of his soul and will soon be captain of his world by right of his own fearless inquiry and discovery is still common. We need in teaching all subjects to make it clear that we are always working on the fringe, and that the mystery remains. Frank admission of the limits of his own knowledge by the teacher is a necessity, admission of mistakes is bare honesty. All subjects treated in school should lead to the mystery of the Unknown; then they lead to God. In this way they contribute to worship, and worship contributes to them in turn by fertilizing the imagination and stimulating the desire to inquire further; but always with reverence and sensibility to the mystery which is life and God. The foundations of humanism are laid in the school. The preoccupation with knowledge, and with academic and sporting success, encourage the pride of human achievement. Pride is the death of sensitiveness. True worship brings these human achievements into relation with God, the Perfect, where they appear in their true perspective. The human reaction then is not pride, but gratitude, humility, repentance, and a sense of forgiveness. Worship is the salvation of scholarship and athleticism.

Reverence and worship are surely most intensely personal. People are the greatest mystery we ever meet apart from God. He is the mystery because He is the Person. Again this is one reason why Jesus taught us to think of God in terms of the best people we have met: 'If ye being evil . . . how much more'. Persons then are the really vital part of a school community. They create the 'atmosphere' of worship, according as they are sensitive to the mystery of life and of God, according as they are holy. The staff, being the more permanent and influential part of the school, really sets the pace, and does most to create or maintain the tradition. Now we cannot outpass our own experience in teaching others. We can and

must admit our own deplorable defects in holiness; this in itself is a necessary part of the battle against humanism. Failure to make that admission is Phariseeism, it is soon recognized by pupils, and frustrates the best efforts in Christian teaching. Much depends upon us. Indeed 'it all depends on me and I depend on God'. The personal element is indispensable in Christian education. Anything else is 'education from the neck up', as A. S. Neill puts it, and we deal with the whole person—the abundant life. History facts and dates, mathematical formulae, and so on may soon be forgotten, usually are, because, in general, they lack an emotional content; but personal relations which affect the emotions create more abiding results. Looked at from the long-range view the most permanent results are produced outside formal teaching and the conscious side of learning. Those things most really learnt steal in by the back door when there is no conscious teaching or learning going on at all. The cinema is possibly more potent in creating the real foundations of thought, the basic assumptions of life, than the school because there is no conscious learning going on there and the appeal is to the emotions as well as the intellect. Strike a boy on the back of his head for not paying attention and he may learn a few more dates and facts, but they will soon be forgotten when the blow is remembered because it got at his emotions. Personal and emotional influences really determine how much a school is Christian.

We ourselves must begin with worship and having once entered into the mystery of worship our most absorbing interest in life is to find and do the will of God, that is, to behave towards others as God behaves towards us. We become merciful because God is merciful. Arrogance, pride, personal irritation, and dignity of the order that is based on physical power and material superiority are ruled out. A community of persons, more or less free, is created, and boys and girls are built into it by the grace of God, middle walls of partition go down and people begin to know one another. The teacher will always remain a mystery to the pupil as the pupil does to the teacher; for familiarity does not breed contempt except among the insincere. Familiarity deepens the mystery of love.

The teachers, of course, are only part of the community. But without real community in staff relations there can be little real community in the school, though the natural joyousness and ready friendliness of the pupils often redeem the failures of the staff. The pupils are the other part of the community and a good deal can be done to help towards sensitive Christian relations among them. The very fact that they are brought together in large numbers in the ordinary school routine compels them to accept the will of the community and respect the freedom of others. So that in preparation for life they learn as much from one another as they do in the formal learning of the school. The normal pupil learns these lessons unconsciously and accepts them without compulsion. The 'difficult' pupil is always one who rebels against the restrictions imposed by community living. Our aim with them is to help them to become sensitive to the needs of other persons. Positive Christian love expressed in the friendliness and patience that despairs of no man is the most powerful instrument to this end. Severity and force may be necessary sometimes, many people think they are necessary. In modern class-room circumstances of large classes and heavy timetables the severity may sometimes be the most merciful course in the interest of the majority; but its value always depends on the degree in which it is inspired by motives of positive love and understanding.

Attention to manners should not be beneath notice. Good manners are the product of worship rather than creators of worship, yet if people grow accustomed by habit, even formally, to give way to others in small things a certain element of reverence to personality is unconsciously created. We cannot really teach manners, because they are of the spirit, they represent an attitude to life; but again there are certain rules and facts we can teach just as in religion itself and wait for the Spirit to take possession and give real life to the facts we have dealt with. Example is stronger than precept. If we treat children, our inferiors in age and learning and physical power, with the respect and courtesy that is due to them, we do something to create that subtle thing called 'atmosphere' from which religion is caught.

## 56 THE SPIRIT OF WORSHIP IN THE SCHOOL

In the actual teaching this sensitivity to people and to God can be encouraged to some extent. Much of what is written in the best modern textbooks on teaching method is of great value in this way. Co-operative methods can be employed in the teaching of nearly any subject. It may not be possible to go as far as Dewey does in his *School and Society*, but there is usually enough freedom left to the individual teacher to enable him to experiment along co-operative lines. One does get to know pupils in these ways. Outside school routine there is usually some scope for drama, concerts, camps, and social work. These all help to break down extreme individualism and also to make the school society less artificial. All these activities may seem to be remote from the subject of worship; but if they are inspired by a religious view of life in the widest sense the connection is clear.

The place of specific acts of worship and religious instruction in this wider view of worship in the school must be left aside for the present; but all that has been written would be sadly incomplete if all we did was to produce a sense of mystery and reverence in the pupil's mind. The key word of the Christian faith is love. Love itself is a mystery; but it is at the same time the simplest thing in life. It is within the reach of all. Love to God is of the same quality as human love. Jesus made it an intimate and real thing to his disciples. To our pupils it must become conscious at some stage. It may be learned unconsciously from the atmosphere of a school and especially by contact with persons who have some experience of it; yet there must be some time at which the love and grace of God are consciously accepted. This is the high light of religious experience. The avenues of approach to it are as many as there are many individuals; but it is a fundamental necessity to worship, and indeed real worship is the conscious acceptance of the love of God and His will.

GERALD G. MYLES

---

## 'THE BRONTËS OF HAWORTH—THROUGH TRIALS TO TRIUMPH'

THERE are few stories which speak so clearly of deathless courage as that of the Brontës. The Rectory of Haworth was for long fiercely besieged, but never capitulated. The besiegers were disease, loneliness, and failure, but these forces could not daunt the heroic sisters. The frail women conquered. They transformed tragedy into triumph. They were hammered on the anvil of sorrow, but were never broken. They were frail, but never brittle. They were battered to fight better. Their courageous example is a constant inspiration to us. Their lives tell us how they marched through pitiless failure to immortal triumph. We look upon the Haworth Rectory as a shrine. It is one in which we kneel and gather fresh courage. All the odds were against them. Blow fell upon blow, tragedy upon tragedy, but they were never subdued.

Let us watch this drama unfold, and see how failure follows failure, and that the fifth act tells of triumph. The drama of Charlotte, Emily, and Anne Brontë is an epic, and is homeric in its nobility. We shall write chiefly of the part played by Charlotte Brontë, for the materials for the drama are so much fuller for her life than they are for the lives of Emily and Anne. We realize, however, that the three sisters are inseparably one. They are a triple cord which cannot be broken.

How wretched was the physical start of all the children of the Brontë family. We give the names of the children in order of their birth: Maria, died aged 12; Elizabeth, died aged 10; Charlotte, died aged 39; Branwell, died aged 31; Emily, died aged 30; Anne, died aged 29. The scourge of consumption slew each of the six children. We will not linger to consider in detail the vacillation, the drunkenness, and the moral deterioration of the brother, Branwell; but these facts must be remembered. The physical frailty of all the family, and the moral defeat of Branwell, paint the Rembrandtesque background. This background shows up all the more clearly the purity and heroism of the three sisters. The mother died when Charlotte was five years old; when Emily was three; when Anne was one. We must remember this, for it tells of an incalculable loss in

the lives of these three children. Nearly all their lives they were without a mother. Although the father outlived them all, they were denied the tender care of a father, for Patrick Brontë was a recluse, and was certainly not intimately and sympathetically bound up in the lives of his children. It is foolish to throw stones at Patrick Brontë; it is equally stupid to fail to see in him a certain remoteness as a father. Thus the home lacked the presence of a mother and the intimacy of a father's love.

The early school life of Charlotte inflicted tragic wounds upon the mind of Charlotte Brontë. She was but a tiny child when she was a pupil at 'Cowan Bridge School for Clergymen's Daughters'. She was only nine years old when disease and the approaching death of her two elder sisters drove Emily and herself from the school. When twenty-two years later she wrote *Jane Eyre*, and described this school under the name of 'Lowood', she still felt the bitter pains and fierce revolt which flamed as a child within her soul, and she makes us enter into her tragedy. She passed happier days at the school of Miss Wooler. Nevertheless upon her school life there fell a devastating blight. Disaster challenged her in her school days, and continued to do so in many more of the experiences of her life. But no disaster conquered her.

By some malignant irony each of the three sisters became a governess. No task could have been more unsuitable for them. Charlotte and Emily felt like two eagles shut up in birdcages, and they beat their wings wildly against the iron bars of bondage.

A robin red-breast in a cage,  
Puts all heaven in a rage.

If the caging of a robin red-breast enrages heaven, what a tempest of anger this captivity of Charlotte and Emily must have caused in the celestial realms! Charlotte wrote about her life as a governess: 'I hate and abhor the very thoughts of governess-ship. But I must do it.' They felt they were treated as pariahs; and that they were slaves in the house of bondage in the land of Egypt. They loathed the snobbery of their mistresses, and their vulgarity, and cruel insincerity. It is difficult to think of a more hateful snobbery than that which



is shown in the story that is told of Charlotte, when she was a governess at Stonegappe. Charlotte Brontë had shown a great kindness to one of the little boys under her charge. She had shielded him, and saved him from a rebuke from his mother. The boy was grateful, and in the presence of his mother and his governess, said: 'I love 'ou, Miss Brontë.' The mother disdainfully replied: 'Love the governess, my dear!' The life of the Brontës as governesses was a grim and ghastly failure. It was not only the fault of their mistresses—we should keep some pity for them. The work of a governess was a task entirely foreign to their nature; it was not their *métier*. These disastrous years as governesses cannot break the Brontës. They are fashioned of sterner stuff. They learn from this disappointment, as they learn from other failures. They know the secret of that alchemy by which failure and frustration can be sublimated, and the base metal become gold. Charlotte Brontë's novels are enriched by the treasures which she rescued from the fire. Both *Jane Eyre* and *Lucy Snowe* (of *Villette*) are fashioned out of metal refined in the furnace of affliction. They agreed that they must escape from this kind of bondage, and be governesses no longer. They decide to found a school, which shall be their own. They know that before they could hope to command success they must improve their qualifications, especially for the teaching of French, and also add to their knowledge of German.

So Charlotte and Emily go to Brussels—Charlotte for two years; Emily for one. What high hopes dawn for them! How eagerly they all looked forward to the days when they would no longer dwell amongst unimaginative aliens, but in the warm friendship of a school, where the three of them would dwell with their scholars in the sweet security of home! How merrily they planned, how joyously they anticipated this gay adventure! They drew up their circulars, telling of the school at the Haworth Rectory, sent them to their friends, and waited for the applications. But not a single person decided to send a child to them—despite the fact that two of the sisters were women of genius, and the other a woman of no mean talent. No failure could have been more complete. But it did not overwhelm them. It was a staggering blow: but not a defeat of

the will. Another door is slammed against them—but they will soon find other doors at which they will knock with heroic fury.

When Charlotte was twenty she sent to Robert Southey some of her poems. He replied courteously to her, but advised her not to look upon literature as a profession. This rebuff silenced her song. About eight years later she says: 'I accidentally lighted on a MS. volume of verse in my sister Emily's writing.' Emily, whose motto was '*Meum Secretum Mihi*', was infuriated. When her anger was hushed, she agreed that her poems and those of Charlotte, and Anne, should be published. After much trouble a publisher was found, who promised to publish the poems at their own charges. In order that the volume should not suffer by carrying the names of three women, they issued the book as the 'Poems of Currer Bell, Ellis Bell, and Acton Bell'. The school venture had brought nothing but failure, and that door was for ever closed. But now it seemed to them probable that the volume of 'Poems' would open to them a door which would give them entrance to a larger life. They were, however, doomed to bitter disappointment. Only two copies of the volume were sold. Two-thirds of a copy was sold for each authoress. Even this disaster, so crushing and complete, cannot break them. They will be stunned, but not defeated. They will soon once again address themselves to the journey. They could have used the words of Dr. Samuel Johnson: 'We may be conquered, but we will not capitulate.'

What courage they possess! They will never capitulate! Since children the three sisters had written stories, and they who were so isolated and unbefriended on the lone Yorkshire moor had peopled both rectory and countryside with the children of their imagination. At night, a little after eight, after their father had gone to bed, they began to tramp up and down the dining-room, undaunted by life's defeats, telling one another their plots for stories. The governess would tell of failure: so did their dream of having a school of their own: their poems spoke of ignominious defeat. All the doors were closed against them. Suddenly a door flew open. They each decided to publish a novel. So three novels were written.

Emily wrote *Wuthering Heights*, Anne wrote *Agnes Grey*, and Charlotte wrote *The Professor*. The first two were published, and received at the time little notice, but there was no publisher for *The Professor* until after the death of Charlotte Brontë. To add to the poignancy of this, her second literary disappointment, her father was threatened with blindness. It was arranged that he should be operated upon for cataract in Manchester, and Charlotte accompanied him there. While in that city, the manuscript of *The Professor* was—as Mrs. Gaskell says—‘curtly rejected by some publisher, on the very day when her father was to submit to an operation. But she had the heart of Robert Bruce within her, and failure upon failure daunted her no more than him.’ It was in a strange city, in lodgings, at the time of her father’s operation, that she began *Jane Eyre*. She writes of this time: ‘Currer Bell’s book—*The Professor*—found acceptance nowhere, nor any acknowledgment of merit, so that something like the chill of despair began to invade “his” heart.’ But it was not her way to be overwhelmed even by despair. She wrestled with her dark foe and conquered, and forced her way through it to the triumph of *Jane Eyre*. From her childhood onwards her hero was the Duke of Wellington. Wellington was not more fearless. Swiftly she leapt into fame. Thackeray, her literary hero, hailed the book with rapture. It became the talk of the town. In October, 1847, when thirty-one, she who had passed through failure after failure, had achieved fame, although she knew it not, which was immortal.

The wine of that cup must have been refreshing to her—but it was soon to be dashed from her lips. Within a short time after the publication of *Jane Eyre*, three members of the family died—in September, 1848, Branwell died; in December of the same year, Emily died; in May, 1849, Anne died. Within eight months there were three deaths in the Brontë family. During these tragic months Charlotte was on the rack of anguish. She wrote of the death of Emily: ‘When I saw with what a front she met suffering I looked on her with an anguish of wonder and love’. O, the anguish of it all! Charlotte was left alone. It is not possible to depict the loneliness of Charlotte. A child lost on a bleak, bare moor could not have

been more lonely than she was. Three sisters had walked and talked together night after night in the dining-room of the Haworth Rectory, but now there was only one left. Charlotte Brontë writes of this time: 'I felt that the house was all silent, the rooms were all empty. The great trial is when evening closes and night approaches. At that time we used to assemble in the dining-room—we used to talk. Now I sit by myself.' All the billows and waves of sorrow have gone over her—yet she is undaunted. She writes of the memory of the tragic loss of her loved ones and says: 'These reminiscences that stand by your bed-side at night, and rise at your pillow in the morning' . . . 'At the end of all, however, exists the Great Hope' . . . 'Eternal life is theirs now.' How controlled she is in her sorrow. She faces it, and says: 'To sit in a lonely room—the clock ticking through a still house—and have open before the mind's eye the record of the year, with its shocks, sufferings, losses—is a trial.' We note the last three words, 'is a trial'. It was that to her—not a blow that conquered her, and reduced her to collapse, but a trial to be endured. It was the trial of faith. And nobly did she endure it, and conquer. She writes: 'But crushed I am not, yet; nor robbed of elasticity, nor of hope, nor quite of endeavour.' She had learned the secret of the words of her sister Anne:

With secret labour to sustain  
In humble patience every blow;  
To gather fortitude from pain,  
And hope and holiness from woe.

Faith, Hope, Love—sustained her. 'The loss', she says, 'of what we possess nearest and dearest to us in this world produces an effect upon the character; we search out what we have left that can support, and when found, we cling to it with a hold of new-strung tenacity.' Religion came to her help, strengthening her will. 'These things would be too much, if reason, unsupported by religion, were condemned to bear them alone.' 'It is my nature when left alone to struggle on with a certain perseverance and I believe that God will help me.' She tells us that Imagination also came to her aid—'The faculty of imagination lifted me when I was sinking, three months ago; its active exercise has kept my head above water

ever since. . . . I am thankful to God who gave me the faculty; it is a part of my religion to defend this gift, and to profit by its possession.' So she comes back to her work, which she had been compelled through the tragic sorrows in her home to lay on one side, and returns to the task of finishing her book—*Shirley*. She recommenced her work at the chapter headed 'The Valley of the Shadow of Death'. She was all too familiar with that dark valley, and had the courage and the knowledge to write about it. Readers of Mrs. Gaskell's *Life of Charlotte Brontë* will be familiar with the story she tells of a recurring dream that came to Charlotte Brontë. She dreamed that she was carrying in her arms a crying babe—often along the aisles of Haworth Church—whose cry she could not still. This dream is an allegory. There was always for her a '*Cri-de-Cœur*'—she was burdened with great sorrow, but she carried it bravely, and sought to still the cry of her broken heart. She could not completely silence it—but she could lessen it, and carry on with her work.

Her sorrows of which we have already written were many and grievous, but the greatest was an impalpable and inescapable one. It was the black night of depression that fell upon her. This was the child of exhaustion and of ill-health. It was beaten off by her indomitable will, but returned again and again to do its dire work. She has transferred her experience to another character—Lucy Snowe of *Villette*. Here we see how it held her like a savage beast by the throat, until she almost collapsed. It was as terrible an experience as that described by William Cowper in *The Castaway*—a poem with which all the three Brontës were familiar. Her lot tells of an agony greater than that of the drowned sailor:

No voice divine the voice allayed,  
 No light propitious shone,  
 When, snatched from all effectual aid,  
 We perished each alone:  
 But I beneath a rougher sea,  
 And whelmed in deeper gulfs than he.

She experienced that rougher sea of unfathomed depression and of black despair. The way in which this consumptive woman fought single-handed against it, and conquered, is the story of her greatest triumph. Two years after the death of Anne, she wrote of 'the heavy burden of depression which, I

confess, has for nearly three months been sinking me to the earth. I never shall forget last autumn. The loathing of solitude grew extreme; my recollections of my sisters intolerably poignant.' For months depression fell upon her, and threatened to crush her with 'a day- and night-mare'. She says: 'I am ill with neuralgic headache, or I am ground to the dust with deep dejection of spirits (not, however, such dejection but I can keep it to myself).' She fights on with heroic fortitude. She looks at it; and does not seek to evade it: 'It will not do to get into the habit of running away from home, and thus temporarily evading an oppression, instead of facing, wrestling with and conquering it, or being conquered by it.' It was a terrible battle—the sort of fight that has been so vividly described by Bunyan. To her came the victory. Deep down it was a triumph of Faith. She shrunk from her trial, but did not shun it. She knew that withdrawal is the way to defeat. She says: 'He who shuns suffering will never win victory. If I mean to improve I must strive and endure.' Looking back upon the drear fights she says: 'It was a time I shall never forget, but God sent it, and it must have been for the best'... 'Submission, courage, exertion, when practicable—these seem to be the weapons with which we must fight life's long battle.' Her victory comes through the belief in another world: 'I often think that this world would be the most terrible of enigmas, were it not for the firm belief that there is a world to come, where conscious effort and patient pain will meet their reward.' It is good to remember that she who fought against such dire circumstance was tender in her judgment, and knew that the strain can be too great: 'The longer I live the more plainly I see that gentle must be the strain on human nature.' There is for her no discharge in this warfare. She brings to it a noble courage. 'But life is a battle, and may we all be enabled to fight it well.' She certainly gained the reward of 'Well done, good and faithful *soldier*'. She is brave enough to look her enemy in the face. 'To shun examination into the dangerous and disagreeable seems to me to be cowardly. I long always to know what really is, and am only unnerved when kept in the dark.'

When we watch the three sisters fighting together against



fierce odds, we look, and wonder at their high courage. But this heroism becomes an even greater spectacle when Charlotte fights with indomitable pluck—alone. The last words her dying sister—Anne—had spoken to her, were: 'Take courage, Charlotte; take courage.' How well she answered that challenge. Six years of life still lay before her. She was lonely, weak in body, her eyesight was failing, but she went on with her work—finishing *Shirley*, writing with newly found skill *Villette*, publishing a selection of the poems of Emily and Anne Brontë, and prefacing it with that poignant description of her sister Emily. Here she dipped her pen in her heart's blood. There is always for Charlotte the work to be done. Here is a little picture of Mrs. Gaskell's: 'We sit up together till ten or past, and after I get to bed I hear Miss Brontë come down and walk up and down the room for an hour or so.' She is alone, but victoriously alone, for she has still her dreams and her task. In her shorter sketch of her sister Anne, she unconsciously also described her own story of triumph. In it she writes of Anne's hope in God as Creator and Saviour: 'And no faltering hope was it, but a sure and steadfast conviction, on which in the rude passage from Time to Eternity she threw the weight of her human weakness, and by which she was enabled to bear what was to be borne, patiently—serenely—victoriously.' That is the story of Charlotte also. She faced the hard blows of life—'patiently—serenely—victoriously'. There was, despite their great sorrow, much joy in the lives of these three sisters—for they were artists. Being creative artists they had heard the morning stars sing together, and all the sons of God shouting for joy. For in birth there is not only travail, but also joy. There was for Charlotte port after stormy seas, and rest after toil. Love came to her and marriage, and almost a year of perfect happiness. Then tragedy swept in upon her once more. There was a short illness and then the sudden collapse. Her last words were: 'I am not going to die, am I? He will not separate us, we have been so happy.' A few days before she reached the age of thirty-nine she died. What does the story tell us, who can see it now, in the perspective of the years? We see that failure could not conquer her in life, neither could death rob her of her triumph. Two years later Mrs. Gaskell's

*Life of Charlotte Brontë* was published, and her heroic story is for ever enshrined in one of the greatest biographies in our language. Surely and steadily her works have found their place amongst the English Classics. Her story speaks of her great allies:

Thou hast great allies:  
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,  
And love, and Man's unconquerable mind.

She and her two sisters call to us to front life with courage—to be undaunted by failure, to weave out of the red thread of pain and disaster the tapestry of triumph. She, and they, were true to Emily's words:

In life and death a chainless soul,  
With courage to endure.

We know nothing more triumphantly defiant than the words of Emily—and all of the sisters now sing them in chorus. We must remember that they were written by a consumptive, in a house where Death became a frequent visitor, with the cemetery on two sides of the Haworth Rectory. Here are the challenging words:

There is not room for Death,  
Nor atom that his might could render void:  
Thou — Thou art Being and Breath,  
And what Thou art can never be destroyed.

The answer to Charlotte's question—'I am not going to die, am I?'—is in her sister's words: 'There is not room for Death.' Charlotte Brontë speaks to us of something unconquered and unconquerable—of something deathless. She fought a good fight, and has won an imperishable name, and liveth for evermore. She has passed through temporal trials to eternal triumph.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH

---

## THOMAS BILNEY<sup>1</sup>

THE three greatest religious movements affecting English life during the last four centuries all began in the zealous spiritual inquiry made by groups of young divines at Oxford or Cambridge. Whereas, however, the leaders of the Evangelical Revival—George Whitefield and the Wesleys—lived long and laborious days in many fields, and Pusey, Newman and Keble saw their work prosper amazingly in Victorian England, the most ardent soul in Cambridge who inspired the future leaders and martyrs of the English Reformation himself died at the stake long before the issues had been made clear.

'Little Bilney' they called him—partly because of his small physical build, but also, one feels, partly with the diminutive which expresses affection. Without him, humanly speaking, we would not have had Latimer, the greatest and most lion-hearted of the reforming preachers, and many another whose name is better known than his own. One cannot read very far into the annals of those days without coming upon Bilney's name and influence. It is like tracing the branches of a delta to a main stream and pushing up its course to the tiny runnel in the mossy hollow of a hill—a single, inconspicuous spring of clear water with, apparently, no great destiny. Bilney was such a source, and those who affirm that, apart from the necessity of Henry VIII's procuring an indisputably legitimate male heir, there would have been no English Reformation, are bringing only the gauge of politics to measure what is plainly the insurgence of the Holy Spirit.

Bilney did not move in the courts of princes; no statesman—lay or ecclesiastical—ever sought his opinion. He was never crowned by the populace, a king of the pulpit at Paul's Cross. Such distinctions came to his friends, but not to him. When he came in procession to St Paul's it was only as a convicted prisoner, carrying the faggot which was an emblem of the doom he had just narrowly escaped.

Yet the student of English religious life would do well to

<sup>1</sup> Our readers will be interested to know that in the April issue we hope to include an article on 'The Recantation of Thomas Bilney', the substance of the Cranmer Prize Essay by E. Gordon Rupp, M.A.—EDITOR.

notice the reality of his influence upon men endowed by nature with greater gifts than he himself possessed for bringing out into the full life of the nation what they had first acquired in his presence. He reveals the loneliness of martyrdom in the poignancy of a spirit that trembles on the verge, withdraws from fear, and then, at a later time, goes to death. These points may best be observed in a short account of Bilney's life.

He was a Norfolk man, born about the year 1495 in Norwich or near by, and of his parentage we know next to nothing. While still a boy he went up to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, was a good student and became a Fellow of his college. The fact that he had proceeded to the degree of LL.B. indicates the direction of his studies. But Law soon became secondary in his life, and religion the main quest. His early ardour for perfection of life reminds one very much of Paul, Luther and Wesley; he sought the hard and narrow way of rigour with small satisfaction; but then came the miracle of joyous love when he knew Christ as his living Saviour. It was the New Testament, just given to the world by Erasmus, that was the immediate means of a conversion true to the classic type. This was in the year 1516 and Bilney would be 21 years of age. Many years later, when the consequences of his conversion had been worked out in a life which was a precursor of the strict evangelical kind, Bilney wrote a series of five letters to Tunstal, the Bishop of London before whom, with other dignitaries, Bilney and Thomas Arthur, a Cambridge companion, appeared on trial for heresy in 1527. These letters, written in Latin, were reprinted by Foxe, the martyrologist, who also translated them. Bilney thus speaks of his beginnings as an advocate of the Gospel way of life:

O mighty power of the most Highest! which I also, miserable sinner, have often tasted and felt, who, before I could come unto Christ, had even likewise spent all that I had upon those ignorant physicians; that is to say, unlearned hearers of confession; so that there was but small force of strength left in me (who of nature was but weak), small store of money, and very little wit or understanding: for they appointed me fastings, watching, buying of pardons, and masses; in all which things (as I now understand) they sought rather their own gain than the salvation of my sick and languishing soul.

But at last I heard of Jesus, even then when the New Testament was first set forth by Erasmus; which when I understood to be eloquently

done by him, being allured rather by the Latin than by the word of God (for at that time I knew not what it meant), I bought it even by the providence of God, as I do now well understand and perceive: and at the first reading (as I well remember) I chanced upon this sentence of St. Paul (O most sweet and comfortable sentence to my soul) in 1 Tim., i., 'It is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be embraced, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am the chief and principal.' This one sentence, through God's instruction and inward working, which I did not then perceive, did so exhilarate my heart, being before wounded with the guilt of my sins, and being almost in despair, that immediately I felt a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch that 'my bruised bones leaped for joy'.

(1st letter to Cuthbert Tunstal, Bishop of London.)

Foxe commented on this first epistle, consisting of the full story of Bilney's conversion, that it 'seemeth more effectual in the Latin than in the English'. Certainly the reader is aware of rare spiritual exaltation and awe in the original of the second paragraph quoted above, which opens,

*Sed tandem de Jesu audiebam, nimirum tum, cum novum Testamentum primum ab Erasmo aederetur,*

and leads on to the famous text from 1 Timothy which is now the third of the 'Comfortable Words' familiar to us in the Office for Holy Communion.

Here let me hazard a speculation. Nothing is told more often or more insistently by a spiritual zealot than the account of his own conversion. In a small man it can become trite and wearisome, but in a great man it loses none of its power for being often told. Bilney, from 1520 to 1527, was the centre of the most spiritual group in Cambridge. Of that group we can speak with some certainty. It included Latimer and Matthew Parker, at least three senior members of Pembroke and three from St. Benet's (now Corpus), the head of a Cambridge community (Barnes, of the Augustinians), and probably Tyndale was sometimes of the company, for his friend and helper in later years, Lambert, was one of Bilney's converts. The whole of Cambridge was presently divided into friendship with or enmity against that group. All these men would surely be as well acquainted with the story of Bilney's sudden conversion as Methodists have been with John Wesley's. Cranmer was in Cambridge—at Jesus—and very sympathetic to reform. The 'Comfortable Words' were introduced into the 1st Prayer-

Book of Edward VI in 1549. They have no place in the Mass. It seems to the present writer, at least, that insistence upon that great text by Bilney, and by Bilney's friends because of him, might well have driven its comfort and exhortation deeply into the mind of the man to whom, more than anybody else, we owe our liturgical forms. Bilney himself had called the text, 'O most sweet and comfortable sentence!'

Bilney was not admitted to Holy Orders till 1519, but immediately after his evangelical experience he had come 'unto this point, that forsaking the knowledge of man's laws, he converted his study to those things which tended more unto godliness than gainfulness' (Foxe).

The picture of Bilney's strenuous days at this period is remarkably like the story of the Holy Club at Oxford two hundred years later. This little man (Wesley also was not a physical giant) was fervent in his study of the Scriptures, preached his spiritual experience with assiduity, but also with considerable adroitness, for he knew (none so well) that this matter was perilously akin to what the Church might reckon as heresy, though for him it was God's naked truth and nothing more. He visited the sick, went to the lepers' beds and drew about them the coverlets that all other folk shrank from touching. He was continually at the jail, ready to listen to the side of the story that never comes into court. There was more true asceticism in his sparse living than in ninety-nine out of a hundred of the professed religious, the monks and friars who were nearer their dissolution than they dreamed. For eighteen months at a stretch he commonly had but one meal a day, bearing the food he saved to prisoners and sufferers. Yet in all this service he had but one end, and would speak of Jesus that he might bring them, one and all, where he had been.

To live on the same stair in college must have been somewhat trying—for the truth is, that martyrs can be difficult neighbours for the ordinary man. A scholar of Trinity Hall, Thirlby, occupied the room below (Thirlby later became the Marian bishop who stripped Cranmer of his insignia!). He was addicted as an undergraduate to fluting on the recorder. He reported that Bilney seldom slept more than four hours in the night and that he could 'abide no swearing and singing'. With his dread



of swearing—especially in a future bishop and his companions—few will quarrel; but it seems that he openly spoke to students not only about rowdy songs, but even that singing used in church services 'was rather a mockery of God than otherwise'. Bilney, however, when perplexed by musical interruptions in nearby rooms, 'would resort strait to prayer'. Men preparing sermons and scarcely helped by their neighbours' wireless have, in more recent days, displayed other means of showing their discomfort!

These are little, but significant items. They show a man continually zealous—a man of one idea. If he did not clearly see already that his earthly end would be an iron chain about his dwarf-like body and the loneliness of dying disowned by his Mother Church, it is, after all, with martyrs as with other men, they go but one step at a time.

The great glory of Bilney is that he and no other was the human instrument of Latimer's conversion.

We have said that all Cambridge was astir over the new ways of religion, yet no mention is made concerning Luther in the early records about Bilney. How could there be? His own conversion occurred in the same year as Luther's first public display of dissatisfaction. Of Luther Lindsay comments:

The earliest traces of *conscious* opposition appeared about the middle of 1516, and characteristically on the practical and not on the speculative side of theology. They began in a sermon on Indulgences, preached in July, 1516. Once begun, the breach widened until Luther could contrast 'our theology' (the theology taught by Luther and his colleagues at Wittenberg) with what was taught elsewhere, and notably at Erfurt. The former represented Augustine and the Holy Scriptures, and the latter was founded on Aristotle.

(Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, vol. i, p. 211.)

The great day of the nailing up of the theses was fifteen months later, All Saints' Day, 1517, so that there could be, as yet, no question of Lutheran influence. Demaus is quite right:

It was to a copy of this New Testament, read by a single, devout student, that the origin of the Reformation movement in the University may be traced.

(Demaus, *Latimer*, p. 25.)

Only in the University?

There is no evidence that Bilney knew Greek. What he says

himself of his purchase of Erasmus's New Testament is: 'Quod cum ab eo Latinius redditum accepi, Latinitate potius quam verbo Dei . . . alectus, emebam. . . .' It was the Latin, not the Greek, that attracted him, and he would not be alone in that respect.

Yet although it is plain that Bilney's conversion was independent of Continental influence, it also cannot be doubted that the doings of Luther and the beliefs of the Continental Protestants presently had a very real interest for him and his friends. That comes out in the story of his approach to Latimer.

In the year 1524 Latimer, then a Fellow of Clare and a very orthodox Churchman (he was Cross-bearer in University processions), was about to proceed to the degree of B.D. by public oration. Bilney was present, and, struck by Latimer's forceful personality, afterwards sought him privately as his confessor. Latimer gives his own account of this meeting:

Master Bilney, or rather Saint Bilney that suffered death for God's word sake; the same Bilney was the instrument whereby God called me to knowledge; for I may thank him, next to God, for that knowledge that I have in the word of God. For I was as obstinate a papist as any was in England, insomuch that when I should be made bachelor of divinity, my whole oration went against Philip Melancthon and against his opinions. Bilney heard me at that time, and perceived that I was zealous without knowledge: and he came to me afterwards in my study, and desired me, for God's sake, to hear his confession. I did so, and, to say the truth, by his confession I learned more than before in many years. So from that time forward I began to smell the word of God, and forsook the school-doctors and such fooleries.

(Latimer, 1st Sermon before the Duchess of Suffolk.)

Latimer then proceeds to relate how this acquaintance with Bilney in 1524 led him to share in the unusual work of visiting prisoners in Cambridge jail and the sick folk of the town wherever he might convert them to Christ.

In personal evangelism of this most intense kind thus brought to bear upon Latimer's life, we see a chosen method of Bilney at this time.

The young men meeting at 'The White Horse' were probably exhilarated at the prospect of the reforms they expected, much as Wordsworth and his contemporaries felt it was bliss to be alive when revolution was in the air. But Bilney himself

was nearly thirty when Latimer joined him, and Latimer was some ten years older.

There was more than the spice of danger that adds zest to life. Quite apart from the King's known hatred of Luther there was the possibility of trouble from offended dignitaries. There would be no lack of charges against these men once their views were proclaimed in pulpits farther afield. Discussion in the friendly dusk 'in Germany' (so their inn was nicknamed), their snug secrecy enhanced as candles were brought and the windows were shuttered, firelight leaping about, distorting the shadows of the oak settles, and turning little Bilney into a giant gesticulating vastly across the rafters, all this was one thing, public propaganda of their private judgments another.

Erasmus, writing three years earlier, in May, 1521, had stated that there were many copies of Luther's works in England, and they were widely read. On May 12th, 1521, Wolsey had gone in glittering state to St. Paul's, and while Fisher preached against Continental doctrines inside, in the churchyard Lutheran books were tossed into a huge bonfire. It followed that at both Universities there was a ban on these pestilential books; and, naturally, they were talked about and smuggled hither and thither. That is always one of the effects of strict religious censorship. But still, although men could hazard very good guesses at the subjects of conversation when Latimer and Bilney walked on the slopes known as 'Heretics' Hill', and more than guesses could be made regarding the debates at 'The White Horse', there was nothing which could be openly attacked. These men were scrupulous in formal religion, they heard the Office, they made no public departure from set practice. Even in July, 1525, West, the truculent and pompous Bishop of Ely, was so far satisfied with Bilney that he granted him full licence to preach anywhere in his diocese. West's Register records it:

*Dominus concessit licentiam Magistro Thomas Bilney ad praedicandum per totam dioc. Elien., ad beneplacitum suum duraturam.*

But at the end of that year West swooped unexpectedly into church when Latimer was preaching to the members of the University, supposing that he would catch him red-handed. What had happened in a few months to sting the

Bishop with alarm? Latimer acted magnificently, stopped himself in mid-flight as a little kestrel does when attacked by a carrion crow, and made his pompous adversary over-balance. He stood silent in the pulpit while the episcopal train entered the church, waited until the Bishop and his retinue were all seated, and then remarked: 'It is of congruence meet that a new auditory, namely being more honourable, requireth a new theme.' The preacher then proceeded to expound, from a new text chosen on the spot, the true office of a bishop! West sent for Latimer afterwards, thanked him for his sermon which expounded his own duties so well, and said he would kiss the preacher's foot if he would preach one sermon against Martin Luther and his doctrine. Latimer's reply, as narrated by Ralph Morice, Cranmer's Secretary, and transcribed by Strype, was:

My Lord, I am not acquainted with the doctrine of Luther; nor are we permitted here to read his works; and therefore it were but a vain thing for me to refute his doctrine, not understanding what he hath written, nor what opinion he holdeth. Sure I am that I have preached before you this day no man's doctrine, but only the doctrine of God out of the Scriptures. And if Luther do none otherwise than I have done, there needeth no confutation of his doctrine.

The Bishop, with understandable asperity, finished the interview by saying: 'I perceive you somewhat smell of the pan; you will repent this gear some day.'

That began the hunt; but the first victim to taste the fire was Bilney, not Latimer.

What, it may here be asked, were Bilney's preached opinions, shared at this time by Latimer and others of the group?

He pleaded for what we would now call the Gospel way of life—a religion earnest and sincere, abstemious, humble, and feeding upon the pure teaching of the Scriptures. His reforming zeal came out especially in his attacks upon saint and relic worship, he denounced pilgrimages to Walsingham and Canterbury, he exhorted the priests to more active pastoral duties, and he refused to acknowledge the mediation of the saints. At first the diocesan authorities did not interfere, and, indeed, to the very end he was orthodox in acknowledging the sacrifice of the mass, the doctrine of transubstantiation and the authority of the Church. Yet Latimer asserted roundly that

he died as a martyr against the evil power of the Papacy.

In 1526 Bilney was summoned before Wolsey. So was Latimer; and it is of Latimer's appearance before the Cardinal that we have a full account, not Bilney's. Wolsey was so much struck by Latimer's sturdy Englishness, his bold demeanour and frank tongue, that he gave him permission to preach anywhere in England 'in the beard' of West, his Bishop, if he wished. Bilney (we infer this from details which emerged at a later stage in his life) was dismissed after promising that he would not disseminate the doctrines of Luther. Such a promise he might very well make, for his own conversion, as we have remarked, was independent of Continental influence, and Luther's position by 1526 was not one which Bilney would wholly share. Bilney, small and insignificant, would make nothing like the impression of Latimer, who had worsted Wolsey's chaplains, to the Cardinal's amusement, in a discussion on points from Duns Scotus, still the supreme test of the schools. If Latimer and Bilney were associated in this inquiry by the Cardinal as being jointly suspect, from this time forward Bilney had to face official inquiry alone. Latimer was behind the bulwark of Wolsey's approval, and it stood him in good stead until the days when the King himself had become his friend.

A year before this inquiry, Wolsey had been anxious to obtain the services of keen teachers for his magnificent project, Cardinal College, Oxford. Accordingly, in 1525, his agents came to Cambridge and had little difficulty in tempting away a group of men, some eight or ten in number, from the Cam to the meadows between Cherwell and Isis where St. Frideswide's provided the nucleus of buildings and funds for the new College, now Christ Church. It is interesting, and is a sidelight upon Wolsey's character that, provided he got the scholarship (and these men had been inevitably under the spell of Erasmus during his stay in Cambridge), he was prepared not to be too inquisitive about their orthodoxy. Among those who were invited, but did not go to Oxford, we find the names of Cranmer and Parker. Had they gone, it is doubtful whether they would ever have become Archbishops. But the men who did go were of Bilney's circle and were more or less influenced

by him. Richard Cox, John Clarke, John Fryer, Godfrey Harman, Henry Sumner, William Betts, John Frith, Goodman, and Ridley, are names of Cambridge men incorporated at Oxford in the late autumn of 1525.

After Wycliffe's outburst in the fourteenth century Lollardry had been kept crushed, if not completely extinguished there, and this in spite of the new interest shown in Greek by Colet and the men of Corpus when Sir Thomas More was a student in Oxford. One can imagine this little group, exiles in spite of the new comfort and riches of the Cardinal's foundation. It was a current joke that the Cardinal had planned a college and completed 'a guzzling-hall', for the hall and kitchen were completed first, and whoever has dined there on a winter's night will recall the long tradition of that kitchen—beef from a Tudor fire, meringues from a Tudor oven. Yet, where two hundred years later the Holy Club would assemble, the ardour of the Cambridge religious life at length made its presence felt. For three years all was quiet, and then heresy burst into sudden flame in the University—of all places, first of all in the Cardinal's own college. Inquiry was instituted. The following extract from a letter written by the Warden of New College (incidentally, he had been Wolsey's agent who reported in 1526 on the kitchen, that 'no two of the best colleges in Oxford have rooms so goodly and convenient'):

Would God my Lord's grace had never motioned to call Clarke, nor any other Cambridge man, into his most towardly college. We were clear, without blot or suspicion till they came; and some of them long time hath had a shrewd name.

If Doctor London of New College, writing thus to Bishop Longland, could have looked forward some thirty years, he might have rubbed his hands at the prospect of three Cambridge men dying in the Town Ditch opposite Balliol, while one of them, Bilney's greatest scholar in Christ, spoke some sublime nonsense about lighting candles that would never be put out!

Meanwhile Bilney himself was approaching a period of trial and danger where he revealed the spectacle of a man hesitating between truth and untruth, knowing that the one led to death while the other could do no more than prolong a troubled existence on earth.



He had made good use of his opportunities to preach since 1525 and, especially in his native Norfolk and Suffolk, he had been continually at work. In some respects Bilney's use of Cambridge as a base from which to range far and wide reminds us of the early adventures of John Wesley. One of the keenest men in his group, Thomas Arthur, actively associated himself with Bilney in this work. It was now they converted a mass priest of Norfolk called Lambert. Henceforth Lambert became very busy as a translator. Foxe says of him:

Which Lambert prospered mightily in the tongues, and specially in the Greek and Latin, and translated many books.

Lambert later became a companion of Tyndale and Frith in Antwerp, and may have been a sharer in the translation of the Bible: he was burned in 1538 after a trial over which the King himself presided. But before that time Bilney himself had endured the flame.

In 1527 Bilney had journeyed in his preaching as far as London. He had preached against the current idolatry associated with roods and relics, and especially named the rood at St. Magnus 'newly erected, before it was gilded; and there was apprehended, and carried with Arthur to Tunstal (the Bishop of London), and so to the coalhouse' (Foxe). 'The coalhouse' was, as its name implies, the particularly gloomy prison at Fulham Palace where the Bishop of London's victims were detained.

It may be wondered why Wolsey had not busied himself amid all these incipient dangers. The fact is, that the Cardinal was inclined to let sleeping dogs lie. The thought that they were only dogs made him tolerant of them; if they snapped at his person or at the revenues of the Church which so greatly interested him, it was a very different matter. For many years he had been more of a thorn in the flesh to dignitaries than to humble people. Froude, in one paragraph, sums up the big difference between Wolsey and his successor as Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More:

Under Wolsey's chancellorship the stake had been comparatively idle; he possessed a remarkable power of making recantation easy; and there is, I believe, no instance in which an accused heretic was brought under his immediate cognizance, where he failed to arrange some terms

by which submission was made possible. With Wolsey heresy was an error—with More it was a crime.

(Froude, *Henry VIII*, vol. i, 6).

Now, on November 27th, 1527, accompanied by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Warham), seven bishops (including London and Ely), and many dignitaries, Wolsey had Thomas Arthur and Thomas Bilney brought before him in the chapter-house at Westminster. It is the kind of scene that holds the eye—the grey stone arches and walls matching the English weather, blue wood-smoke rising from London's chimneys and drifting across the clear waters of the Thames; scarlet and gold in profusion, scarlet gloves and cushions for Wolsey, purple on the bishops, ermine on the lawyers, and 'little Bilney' standing there in sombre poor clothes, small of body, shrunken by prison, unimpressive in gesture and voice. Like Paul, he knew that in his presence there was little to commend his cause.

Wolsey asked Bilney whether he had knowingly taught or preached to people in private or public opinions which were Luther's, or those of any other men condemned by the Church. He replied that he had not wittingly done so or taught anything that he believed to be contrary to the accepted teaching of the Catholic Church. Wolsey asked him whether he had not once taken oath that he would not only refuse himself to proclaim Luther's opinions, but would impugn them. On this point poor Bilney hesitated, even—is the word too strong?—equivocated; for he admitted he had given his word, 'but not judicially'. It seems a meaningless quibble to the modern mind. He was then sworn, and promised to answer plainly the questions put to him during the inquiry. Then Wolsey turned to Bilney's friend and pointedly asked him whether he had not said to Sir Thomas More that 'in the sacrament of the altar there was not the very body of Christ'. He denied this.

Of course, this questioning by Wolsey was merely the opening gambit. Churchmen never took the trouble to stage a full dress inquiry without the accused man's learning what it feels like to be a mouse caught by a cat. Witnesses were called—and there was no lack of them, especially among the friars, ready to say what Bilney had preached in the diocese

of Norwich as well as in London. Day after day the trial went on until December 7th—eleven days and nights of unceasing harrying, for the Churchmen, religious and secular, were thoroughly angry because of Bilney's denunciation of images, pilgrimages, their own self-interest and manner of living. Apart from such an ordeal, Bilney was sensitive and naturally timid.

Thirty-four formal questions were put to the accused. It would be wearisome and unnecessary to give them all, but some of them are very interesting because they are pointers to the Puritanism which would presently sweep undeniably on to the stage of English life. Was Christ alone to be prayed to? Were all true Christians, laity as well as clerics, priests with the right of binding and loosing, if they had received the Spirit of God? Should the language of the people be used and masses and gospels read publicly in the vulgar tongue? Ought the whole Scripture to be translated into English? Should all organs and all manner of singing be abolished from the worship of the Church? These are a few of the questions which show, if not what Bilney really proclaimed, at least what many people thought he believed.

Three times, under pressure from Tunstal, the Bishop of London, Bilney was exhorted to recant and place himself under the merciful judgement of the Church. On the great questions which would be pressed at Latimer's trial more than twenty years later, little was said. Bilney was orthodox on the Mass, and he made no denial of the authority of the Church. Protesting against relics, pilgrimages and prayers to the saints, advocating accessibility of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue and urging better observance of duty upon the clergy, these might be serious matters, but no single one of them was sufficient to bring a man to the stake. Yet, taken all in all, this was a charge of heresy—and how terrible heresy was in the minds of men in that day, we can have little knowledge. Nothing is more difficult than to get inside the skin, as it were, of a man daring at that time to stand alone, by the right of religious conviction privately obtained and pitting it against the awful majesty and power of the Church. For a thousand years that Church had held sway over life. The

common people knew that even an Emperor had been kept waiting in his shirt, standing barefoot in the snow for three days until a carpenter's son, but the Pope none the less, restored him to the Church; they knew that the murder of an Archbishop had brought the proudest and strongest of England's kings to bitter penance. However much men might writhe because of injustice, petty persecution, violation of their family life, even though the whispered scandals of the village alehouse came into writing with Langland's and Chaucer's descriptions of the religious and their ways of life, yet the Church stood as she had done for a thousand years. In every land, and every day, the peasant in the field and the rising merchant in the town, the toiling housewife and the hawking nobleman, were like Browning's bishop and could

Hear the blessed mutter of the mass,  
And see God made and eaten all day long,  
And feel the steady candle-flame, and taste  
Good strong thick stupefying incense-smoke.

They knew that the Church was not only an anvil that could wear out all hammers; the Church had a hammer that suited its own anvil, and not only a man's body and goods could be crushed, but his immortal soul—the most real of all realities—could be shut out from life and hope of ease for ever and for ever. Our busy lives, in this age of mechanical miracles, with their shortened views and closed horizons, have lost the dread of eternal doom, as of a funeral bell, in those words, 'for ever'; but to folk even at the end of the Middle Ages what they represented mattered more than anything else. Columbus was not doing so brave a thing in confronting the unknown West as Bilney was attempting, facing an eternal voyage with no blessing of the Church upon him. He was inexpressibly lonely.

Day after day little Bilney, longing to remain in full communion with the Church, but unable to deny the truth by which Christ had made him free, sought to show his accusers what he saw so clearly—that truly he was not in error. Day after day his superiors sought to gain his recantation. They had gained Arthur's surrender fairly easily, and his sentence was not heavy—a public penance, a very short detention, and after that he was not to preach till licensed by his bishop. A time

would soon come when offenders would have shorter shrift, but now, if they could gain Bilney's recantation, might not the danger of popular and widespread heresy be averted, since this man was, in Cambridge at least, 'the first framer' of such ways?

On December 4th Tunstal himself pleaded with Bilney to recant; twice on the next day he pleaded. These three times the little man was unmoved. Tunstal had had good opportunities of learning the sincerity, and even the fundamental orthodoxy of his victim, for Bilney, as well as speaking before him, had addressed to him the five letters which give us his inward convictions and the history of his spiritual development.

Bilney pleaded for more time in which to consult with his friends. They, as well as his opponents, were counselling submission. At his fourth and last chance he broke down and abjured. He yielded completely and miserably.

It was on December 7th that 'He answered, that now he was persuaded by Master Dancaster and others his friends, he would submit himself, trusting that they would deal gently with him, both in his abjuration and penance'. He was condemned to a prison to be named by the Cardinal and retained during his pleasure, but first must walk bareheaded before the procession into St. Paul's, carrying on his shoulder the faggot with which he was to stand full in the preacher's eye during sermon time.

It is a pathetic picture—all the sadder because Bilney, like Peter, knew that only temporary weakness had caused his denial

His public penance done, for over a year he was in the Tower, and then, set free, he returned to Cambridge broken-hearted. Latimer and his best friends gathered round him. They found him humiliated, haunted. He had saved his miserable little body, and he was ashamed of it. Latimer spoke of his inward torment when preaching before Edward VI nearly twenty years later:

I knew a man myself, Bilney, little Bilney, that blessed martyr of God, what time he had borne his fagot, and was come again to Cambridge, had such conflicts within himself, beholding this image of death,

that his friends were afraid to let him be alone: they were fain to be with him day and night, and comforted him as they could but no comforts would serve. As for the comfortable places of scripture, to bring them unto him it was as though a man would run him through the heart with a sword; yet afterward, for all this, he was revived, and took his death patiently, and died well against the tyrannical see of Rome. We will be to that bishop, that had the examination of him if he repented not! Here is a good lesson for you, my friends; if ever you come in danger, in durance, in prison for God's quarrel, and his sake, as he did for purgatory-matters, and put to bear a fagot for preaching the true word of God against pilgrimage and such like matters, I will advise you first and above all things, to abjure all your friends, all your friendships; leave not one unabjured. It is they that shall undo you, and not your enemies. It was his very friends that brought Bilney to it.

(7th Sermon before Edward VI.)

And yet some of his friends were the brightest jewels in the martyr's crown and showed presently that they were ready to follow him where he, first of all, in spite of his recantation before Tunstal, led the way.

For a little more than two years Bilney endured his private anguish. A reference made to him by 'his scholar' at this time leads one to suppose that he had taken up academic work again. He was certainly living in college. But his penitence had turned to new purpose. About 10 o'clock on a spring night in 1531 he called his friends together. They met in his rooms in Trinity Hall where he bade them a solemn farewell, 'For', he said, 'I must needs go up to Jerusalem.' He left Cambridge and wandered about the countryside of Norfolk, distributing copies of Tyndale's New Testament, preaching in religious households in private, and openly in the fields. It would seem that he went as far as London, for he was seen at Greenwich six weeks before his arrest in Norwich, where he had given an anchoress an English New Testament and 'The Obedience of a Christian Man'. In this determined and open-eyed offering of himself, Bilney everywhere proclaimed his sorrow at his previous weakness, said that the doctrine he had preached before his recantation was the truth, and wished men to be warned by him 'never to trust to their fleshly friends in causes of religion'.

He came now into the grip of Nix, the blind Bishop of Norwich. Wolsey had died in 1530 and the functions of Church and State were no longer combined in one person.



More was Lord Chancellor, representing the secular arm, and Foxe reports that when Nix sent for a writ to burn Bilney, More remarked to the messengers: 'Go your ways and burn him first; and then afterwards come to me for a bill of my hand.'

While Bilney lay in prison the friars were diligent to obtain another recantation. They had no success. Nor was the trial lengthy. Bilney was a relapsed heretic; he had been caught in the act of disseminating heretical literature. He was examined, condemned and degraded. The night before he went to the stake he sat quietly talking with friends who were allowed to see him. He was of cheerful heart (and this calm joy is reflected in a fragment of a letter written in English to his father and mother). He said that, on the next day, though the fire might be of great heat to his body, God's Spirit would cool it. Then little Bilney, who had for two years endured the fires of remorse, put his hand into the candle-flame and held it there, steady and unflinching. 'What do you, Master Bilney?' said the doctor who was with him. 'Nothing, but trying my flesh by God's grace, and burning one joint, when to-morrow God's rods shall burn the whole body in the fire.'

The next day, Saturday, October 19th, 1531, he came, degraded and wearing a layman's gown, to the stake in Lollard's Pit in his native Norwich. He recited his articles of belief, which were those of the creeds commonly said, exhorted the bystanders to be true in faith and life, and forgave his enemies, but there was no recantation. After the flames had tortured him cruelly, for the dry reeds flared up swiftly and were blown backwards and forwards about him by a strong wind before the wood caught, the little body sank into nothingness.

More, in his writing against Tyndale, sought later on to establish that Bilney again recanted and read a bill of abjuration. Latimer asserted definitely that he died 'against the tyrannical see of Rome', and in all the reports (printed by Townshend in the Appendix to vol. iv of his edition of Foxe's *Acts*) concerning any supposed abjuration at the stake, there is such confusion, hearsay and indefiniteness that the straight

verdict of his friends remains the only one to be believed. If More had contented himself with pointing out that Bilney was orthodox on the Mass he would have been on sure ground. But that he died under More's writ and without the consolation of the Sacrament and the blessing of the Church is undoubted. Besides, there was one man present at his burning who, though no martyr, was of undoubted probity—Matthew Parker; and he breathed no word of Bilney's faltering. Among the treasures which Parker later bequeathed to his old college, Corpus Christi, Cambridge, was Bilney's Bible, much annotated in his own hand and very heavily marked with a pen at the words in Isaiah xliii, 'Cum ambulaveris in igne, non combureris' (When thou walkest in fire, thou shalt not be burned).

And they had called him, 'Little Bilney'!

HAROLD S. DARBY

## THE YEARS OF UNREST: 1790-1800<sup>1</sup>

### Part II

**I**F the first great issue confronting the Society was that of Leadership, the second was undoubtedly that which concerned the relationship of Methodism to the Church of England. This involved not only the question of Church attendance, but that of the Sacraments. In this problem, as in that of succession to himself, Wesley realized the possibility of unrest and he attempted his own solution. But in this attempt his High Churchmanship proved a serious handicap. It is true that he had modified his views in the interests of his work. His preaching in the open air, his disregard of Parish boundaries,<sup>2</sup> his appointment of preachers, his building of chapels; and the legal measures<sup>3</sup> he was forced to take to preserve the continuity of his work, are all indications of an unwilling separation from the established Church. The last and most significant illustration of this movement away from the Church was the ordina-

<sup>1</sup> The first part of this article appeared in the October 1941 issue.

<sup>2</sup> 'I look upon the whole world as my Parish.' May 11, 1739.

<sup>3</sup> Model Deed 1763 and Deed of Declaration 1784.

tion of preachers to America (1784).<sup>1</sup> Last of all in 1787 he decided that all Methodist Chapels should be licensed under the Toleration Act of 1689 and thus secure legal recognition and freedom from possible penalties.

Beaumont said justly that: 'Wesley, like a strong and skilful rower looked one way, while every stroke of his oar took him in an opposite direction.' Whatever his actions suggested, at least his face was ever toward the Church of England. It was almost inevitable for his father was a clergyman and his mother at an early age had by her own choice ceased to be a Dissenter and became a member of the Church of England. He was educated at Oxford, the very citadel of Anglicanism. Here he inherited a strong tradition of loyalty to Church and King. Before his conversion he was so zealous a High Churchman that he refused the Lord's Supper to all who had not been baptized by a minister episcopally ordained. He refused to bury all who had not been baptized and he insisted on the re-baptism of all children of Dissenters wishing to enter the Church. Even after his conversion he held views of the nature of Holy Communion which differed hardly at all from that of the leaders of the Oxford Movement. As a matter of interest hardly any clergyman in his century urged upon his people more than Wesley did the necessity for the most frequent attendance at Holy Communion, and his High Church theory of the Sacrament found perfect expression in the great Eucharistic hymns of his brother Charles. To the end of his days John Wesley knew himself to be a sacrificing priest. He would only allow those of his preachers who had been episcopally ordained to administer the rite.<sup>2</sup> When his preachers were not ordained, the people had to receive Sacrament at the hands of the Parish Priest. But this was of no concern to Wesley, for he urged all Methodists to hold their own Services outside Church hours, so that they might attend the Services at the Parish Church. In 1786, he wrote to one of them: 'If you are resolved, you may have your services in Church hours, but remember, from that time you will see my face no more.' The

<sup>1</sup> See his letter to Coke and Asbury, dated Bristol, September 10, 1784. He later ordained twenty-five preachers in Scotland and England.

<sup>2</sup> *New History of Methodism*, vol. 1, p. 488.

<sup>3</sup> He did, of course, ordain many preachers himself.

next year, he dared to say, 'when the Methodists leave the Church of England, God will leave them'. This statement he reiterated in 1788 declaring that it had been the glory of the Methodists not to be a separate body, and that the more he thought, the more he was convinced that Methodists ought not to leave the Church. At the very end of his long life (1789) he said: 'I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I do not believe Methodists in general design it, when I am no more seen. I do and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England; and none who regard my judgement or advice will ever separate from it.' Dr. Rigg was probably right in showing how closely Wesley studied and admired Loyola, and how much he desired that Methodism might do for the Church of England what the Society of Jesus had done for the Church of Rome. Wesley would have been well content had Methodism become 'an affiliated branch of the Church of England'.<sup>1</sup>

But his own actions, as well as the sweep of events, were too strong to be resisted. When he died, Methodism was involved in a contradiction of Wesley's own making. It had links alike with Dissent and with the Established Church; but there could be no real doubt, where the future path lay. Wesley's solution was no solution, for under his strong government and his desire 'Church or no Church to save souls', Methodism had unwittingly become a separate body. The Church did nothing to heal the breach. Wesley himself received no encouragement from the Bishops, and with few exceptions,<sup>2</sup> indifference or active hostility from the clergy. The refusal to administer the Sacrament to the saintly Mrs. Fletcher, in the very Church where her husband had for so long been Vicar, was typical of the prevailing attitude. Even those Methodists who sought Communion at the Parish Church were often denied access to the Lord's Table. But even if the leaders of the Church had been willing to reverse their attitude, it is doubtful whether Methodism could ever have fulfilled Wesley's hopes, as a society within the Church.

<sup>1</sup> The words of the late Dr. Rigg.

<sup>2</sup> For a list of the better known exceptions see my *This Methodism*, p. 55.

The truth is, that whilst some of the Preachers, and many of the wealthy trustees shared Wesley's views, the large majority of the people wanted a complete separation from the Church. Happily, there was no need to make a definite decision on the issue. The matter was solved by the simple process of leaving it to time. It was only after the lapse of thirty years (1821) that the assistants were called Ministers. Until then, underneath their portraits in the Magazine, they were styled simply, 'Mr. —, Preacher of the Gospel'. In theory at least, they were helpers of the regular clergy. For a much longer period, the deceased were buried in the Church burying-ground and whilst the clergyman officiated, the Methodist Ministers attended simply as mourners. Marriages were likewise celebrated mainly in the Parish Church, and many Methodists took their children to the Church for baptism.<sup>1</sup> It was not until the latter half of the century that Methodism definitely allied itself with the Free Churches. Whilst Methodism was conservative in its tone and temper, it looked with a certain suspicion on the Free Churches as being tainted with radicalism. It was only the triumph of liberalism within the Methodist Church that enabled Hugh Price Hughes to seek a federation with other Free Churches and the creation of a Nonconformity with 'a Nonconformist conscience'. Even then the small 'Church and Tory' party within Methodism regarded the alliance with a certain lukewarmness. So long was it before Methodism not only knew itself to be a separate Church, but identical with Nonconformity in its aims and interests.

If then the larger question solved itself in the course of time, there were other issues that could not be so conveniently shelved. The question of Church attendance had been settled by Wesley himself. In 1789 he had been very reluctantly compelled to allow Methodists, where necessary, to attend their own Services within Church hours. But there remained the problem of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. With the exception of City Road Chapel, London, Broadmead in Bristol, and perhaps one or two other places, Methodists had always to go to the Established Church to receive Communion. This was

<sup>1</sup> It was not until 1836 that marriages could be celebrated in the Free Churches, and not until 1880, by the Burial Laws Amendment Act, could Dissenters be buried according to their own customs.

an intolerable position for those who had no affinities with the Church but had come into the Methodist Society without any previous Church connexion. It was equally irritating to those who had to receive the elements at the hands of a clergyman they despised and whose private life they knew to be blameworthy. There were others who were refused access to the Lord's Table by the officiating clergy, and their case was especially hard. Since their own preachers could not, and the clergy would not, administer the rite, they were deprived of its benefits. The majority of the preachers shared the people's view, partly because they realized the logic of history, and partly because they wanted their status recognized and believed they had an equal right with the clergy to administer the Sacrament.<sup>1</sup>

There was, however, another party smaller in numbers but great in influence. Many of the trustees were brought up in the traditions of the Church, and resented any liberalizing tendencies. They were, in most instances, wealthy men who exercised a large control over their particular societies, and they desired only to walk in the old ways. They were supported by the few clergymen who were in direct association with Methodism, by many of the preachers ordained by Wesley, and by a few other preachers who had a strong loyalty and affection for the Church.

The first trumpet blast of battle was sounded by eighteen trustees who issued a circular from Hull.<sup>2</sup> They urged Methodists not to profess themselves Dissenters, not to hold worship during Church hours, and not to have the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered in their Chapels. The circular concluded with the observation that: 'Methodists who separate from the Church of England will dwindle away into a dry, dull and separate party.'<sup>3</sup> Thus encouraged, others wrote circulars in similar terms.<sup>4</sup> It was, of course, the age of the pamphlet. Wesley had done much to stimulate a habit which was most freely indulged during the period of the Evangelical Revival. Whenever men were heated by passion, they flew to

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Plan of Pacification came through the unremitting pressure of the people and not the preachers.

<sup>2</sup> May 4, 1791.

<sup>3</sup> See Wm. Redfern, *Modern Developments in Methodism*, p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> Birmingham and Sheffield were amongst the towns from which such circulars were issued. See G. Smith, *History of Methodism*, vol. 1, p. 13.



their pens and wrote their 'Calm Addresses' or their 'Calm Replies'. This was as true of politics as of religion. For if Hannah More wrote her tracts pleading for loyalty to King and Constitution, others such as Tom Paine, Piggott, and Thelwall were willing to sound strident counterblasts. The tracts in each case were sold to many hundreds of thousands of people,<sup>1</sup> Wilberforce's long tract *The Practical view of prevailing Religious systems contrasted with real Christianity* was on almost every bookshelf, whilst Legh Richmond's simple story of the *Dairyman's Daughter* with its affecting death scene, had a sale of two million copies.<sup>2</sup> It was natural therefore that the Sacramental question should produce a wordy warfare in which tracts were the favourite weapons. Kilham was early in the fray. He replied from Alnwick to the Hull circular and asked whether the Sacrament should not be administered by the Ministers who watch over the spiritual interests of the people, and are their daily friends. The Conference of 1791 avoided the issue by resolving 'to follow strictly Mr. Wesley's way'. The agitation increased in volume and at the next Conference the singular course of deciding by lots, was taken. When Adam Clarke drew the lot which declared 'You shall not give the Sacrament during this year', it was officially stated that 'all were satisfied. All submitted. All were at peace'. But this happy frame of mind did not long continue. The good John Pawson expressed a general sentiment when he said: 'Unless liberty is given to those preachers and societies who wish to have the Sacrament, we shall have a division among the preachers and people.'<sup>3</sup> Conference issued an instruction that 'the Lord's Supper shall not be administered by any person among our Societies in England and Ireland for the ensuing year, on any consideration whatever'<sup>4</sup> at the very time when certain Societies such as those in Liverpool and Manchester had arranged for the Sacrament to be administered to them. The controversy broke out with such fresh vigour that the District Meetings in Manchester, Halifax, and Leeds passed resolutions deprecating violent speeches on the matter.

<sup>1</sup> *British Critic*, 1799, p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> See Amy Cruse, *The Englishman and his Books in the Nineteenth Century*.

<sup>3</sup> G. Smith, *History of Methodism*, vol. 1, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> An exception was made in the one case of London, where ordained clergymen served the Societies.

Nevertheless, many of the preachers were, in the words of the eminent Adam Clarke, 'resolved to have liberty of conscience or go to the ends of the earth for it'. A step forward was taken by the Conference of 1793. It was decided that where unanimous desire for the Sacrament at the hands of their Preachers, was expressed, it should be granted. This could not be a final solution of the subject for it left the power of veto in the hands of any one man, however obstinate and prejudiced that man might be. In any case, when the next Conference assembled, it was found that nearly a hundred Societies unanimously desired the Sacrament to be administered to them by their own preachers. The Conference made a cautious and timid relaxation of the rule requiring unanimity, and asked only that the Lord's Supper be observed when the 'union and concord of the Society' could not be preserved without it. Concessions, however, do not satisfy but only stimulate the appetite of those who demand, and they are encouraged to sustain their pressure until all they desire is granted. So it was that after the Conference of 1794, agitation increased in violence. It was focused in the refusal of the trustees of the 'Old Room' at Bristol to allow Henry Moore to use their pulpit because he had administered the Sacrament in Portland Chapel. Quite apart from the immediate issue it meant that if trustees could expel a Minister from their Chapel, then they would hold absolute power in their own places, and the Methodist connexional system would become unworkable. The people were virtually unanimous in their support of Moore, and at a District Meeting of Preachers, all except Benson, Rodda, and Vasey supported Moore's conduct in the unhappy affair.<sup>1</sup> Difference of views, however, did not prevent Benson and Moore and Bradburn seeking together to find a right solution of a problem which had assumed alarming proportions. It was under the shadow of the controversy that the Conference met in 1795. The very first business was to elect by ballot nine men to serve on a Committee and submit a plan of settlement to Conference. The nine men chosen gave complete satisfaction not only because they were undeniably the most eminent,

<sup>1</sup> For the complete account of this agitation in Bristol see G. Smith, *History of Methodism*, vol. II, pp. 26, 29.

but because between them, all points of view were represented. They met and produced a plan which with the alteration of a single article was passed unanimously by Conference. The Plan of Pacification had many clauses relating to other matters,<sup>1</sup> but on the burning issue of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper it declared that 'the Lord's Supper shall not be administered in any Chapel except the majority of the Trustees of that Chapel on the one hand, and the majority of the stewards and leaders belonging to that chapel (as the best qualified to give the sense of the people) on the other hand, allow it. Nevertheless in all cases the consent of the Conference shall be obtained before the Lord's Supper is administered'. It might be supposed that these restrictions would still provide a hindrance to the people's demand for Sacrament in their own Chapels. Actually, the desire was so general that a large number of Chapels at once were able to comply with the regulation and within the next thirty years the Sacrament was being administered in all Methodist Churches throughout the whole connexion.<sup>2</sup> The process had worked itself out to its inevitable conclusion. Despite the wishes of Wesley and his affection for the Church of England, Methodism, even when he died, was in effect a separate Church and the last decade of the eighteenth century was only one of unrest because the Societies were struggling to awareness of the fact. In this struggle, the few held back the many until the logic of events could be denied no more.

The truth is that Methodism for too long had been kept in swathing bands. When Wesley died and the initiative passed to his preachers they could not easily assume a responsibility for which they had not been trained. Their task was made more difficult by reason of the agitation which the French Revolution aroused in England. The fact that radicalism was associated with Dissent made it difficult for Methodist leaders so closely bound to the Church, to move forward. In the last years of the century when war with France had been declared, reform assumed a seditious air. Pitt had the support of the

<sup>1</sup> Chiefly regarding the way in which the Sacrament should be administered: the burial of the dead: and the conduct of Services in Church hours. For the whole text see Appendix O in Smith's *Methodism*, vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> In the majority the administration of the Sacraments took place within a few years of the Plan of Pacification.

nation when he instituted a series of repressive measures (1797). The short phase of revolutionary ardour had quickly passed, and now to be a radical was to be suspected of republicanism and infidelity. Reform had ceased to be respectable. Kilham showed the true way forward. In his desire that Ministers should administer the Sacrament in their own Chapels, in his view that Methodism was naturally allied to Dissent and not to the Anglican Church, and in his proposals for lay representation on Church Courts, he anticipated what later came to pass. All his hopes were in time fulfilled. But he was young, tactless, and unwilling to compromise. Contemporary events which overawed his brethren only served to stimulate him. It seemed almost indecent that a young, unknown Minister should gaily offer combat to the revered fathers of the Church, and that in polemical controversy he should deliver such hard and stinging blows. His expulsion was inevitable. If by a miracle his line of advance had been followed, Methodism might have become the Church of the Industrial Revolution: the natural home of the new working classes. As it was, seating arrangements and pews showed a growing class-consciousness. Wesley had said that the Bible knew no holiness but social holiness; nevertheless holiness was now interpreted in terms of *laissez faire*.<sup>1</sup> Methodist preachers supported Sidmouth's policy of savage reaction even when all need for it had vanished. And so it was easy for Bunting with his undeviating Toryism to be for many years the authentic voice of Methodism. If Methodism had not to make a fresh start in the troubled first years of the French Revolution, how different its history might have been.

Even as it was indications of a more liberal spirit were present. The theology of John Wesley and the hymn-books of Charles Wesley were alike a commentary on the significance of the individual person. Kilham was right in declaring that Methodism in possessing Class Leaders and Local Preachers had democratic institutions which needed only to be developed. The defeat of such ultra Tories as Coke and Mather, who after Wesley's death would conceivably have welcomed episcopate government with the power in their own hands, was a welcome

<sup>1</sup> In this respect it was influenced by the thought process of the age. Benthamism, the philosophy of Individualism, was dominant in political theory. The Evangelicals were politically staunch Benthamites.

sign. The founding of the Methodist New Connexion with its democratic constitution was indicative of a liberalism that could not be suppressed. It is true that reform was long delayed and much valuable time and ground was lost; but even in this decade, signs were not wanting that one day, preachers and people would move forward together in a living partnership.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE.—I have consulted again all the relevant books and material used in the writing of my three books:

*John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century.*

*After Wesley.*

*This Methodism.*

The first two books have long bibliographies.

The footnotes will indicate those books which I have most frequently used in the writing of this essay. The histories (especially Smith, Stevens, and the New), the Works, Minutes, and the Magazine have provided the standard works of reference.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

# Notes and Discussions

## CONSCIENCE AND THE UNCONSCIOUS

WE shall probably do no better by way of definition than call conscience, in Butler's words, 'that principle by which we survey and either approve or disapprove our own heart, temper and actions'.<sup>1</sup> It is easy to see where certain terms of this statement might be modified, and the flavour of what has been called 'intuitionism'. Allowing for this, however, the definition may be assumed tentatively.

Discussions on this subject are not as fashionable as they were. Conscience, indeed, may seem to have gone the way of the mythical Mrs. Harris—the very conscience of Betsy Prig, by the way!—after Sairey Gamp's scepticism had dismissed her so very summarily. That, however, only concerns the separate existence of a specific intuitive faculty, King of faculties, though upon Butler's own famous words an uncrowned king.

It will not be entirely unjust to say that Analytical Psychology does not indulge the term very greatly. This may mean that a deterministic framework leaves little room for such a factor, though Freud admits there is probably a 'fragment of psychological truth in the assertion that conscience is of divine origin'.<sup>2</sup> But it is apparently a psychological rather than a moral factor. Freud speaks also of an 'ego-ideal' which becomes a standard by which to measure the self, and this 'self-criticizing faculty' is equated with 'conscience', and also with the censor of dreams. Again, 'there is hardly anything that we separate off from our Ego so regularly as our conscience and so easily set against it'.<sup>3</sup> But Freud also maintains that conscience 'has not been there from the beginning', adding that it differs from sexuality in this, sexuality having been present from the very beginning of life. In another work<sup>4</sup> conscience is described as 'a critical faculty (Instanz) within the Ego which even in normal times takes up a critical attitude toward the Ego'. In addition to the equation of conscience with the Ego-Ideal it is further described as the moral conscience, the censor of dreams, and the chief influence in repression. It is also acknowledged that where there is otherwise complete compliance to suggestion under the influence of hypnotism 'the moral conscience of the person hypnotized may show resistance'. This seems generally allowed, but Freud may be suspected of discounting the fact by adding that 'some knowledge may be retained' by the patient whereby he is aware that the hypnotic state is an unreal experience—'an untrue reproduction of another situation of far more importance to life'.<sup>5</sup>

Upon this rather confused account it would appear that there are moral as well as psychological factors in conscience, and even a suspicion of its divine origin! It is so distinct a faculty that it can cause a

<sup>1</sup> Sermon 11.

<sup>2</sup> *New Introductory Lectures*, p. 81 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Group Psychology*, etc., p. 68 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 79.



schism in the body, with attendant neurosis no doubt. 'Some such faculty develops in our Ego which may cut itself off from the rest of the Ego and come into conflict with it.'<sup>1</sup> Conscience is also said to be the chief influence in repression, but since conscience asserts itself so often after the fact, negatively so to speak, this statement may need qualification. It operates when we have loosed ourselves in action, when we have 'let off steam', as we may say. Conscience operates in enervation as well as in stringency.

The more serious part of our criticism, however, is that we must stoutly deny that conscience has not been with us from the beginning. Whether Freud is right about sexuality is not now our consideration, but he is surely wrong about conscience. It would weary the reader to give a tithe of the evidence: The germs of a moral judgement are in the lower animals—those which are domesticated more particularly perhaps, but also those which are wild and gregarious. The rude savage cannot be denied his quota.

The main fact is that conscience is really another side of consciousness<sup>2</sup> and, if so, it must be original—in our being from that beginning, at all events. The Ego or self, by means of its conscious mind, finds an external world of experience quite apart from any judgement upon it. That is one side of consciousness wherein it may be a-moral rather than moral. But in what might be called our conscientious moments the Ego is judging, accusing or condemning. These things may be divorced in analysis like this, but they are probably originally inseparable.

We desire, however, to relate conscience to the Unconscious, as conceived by Analytical Psychology. We have found Freud speaking of 'the prolongation of the conscience into the Unconscious', and with some apology he talks of 'an unconscious sense of guilt'.<sup>3</sup> By a prolongation we must suppose that Freud means a prolongation from above (the conscious mind) into the realm below (the Unconscious). This, in his theory, might be a case of repression. On the contrary, however, may not the fact of conscience appearing in the Unconscious be an evidence that it is a feature of the Unconscious itself? The whole trouble seems to be that Freud knows no good of the Unconscious. It is little more than a mental and moral dump—a kind of psychological sewer without adequate discharge. Not so Jung, with his theory of the Absolute or Primordial Unconscious. In Jung's view there is some fundamental and initial endowment here. There is a ground-pattern in our psychology as there is a ground-pattern in our physiology. If we may use the figure of the Well, in which Truth is proverbially at the bottom, it is not only open to the pure or impure draughts which may be cast upon its surface, but it is fed also from below and may take from its deep, dark recesses not only taint and poison, but tonic property and fragrance, and most of all (in significance, if not in volume) the forceful stream of clarity and purity flowing from a more mysterious source. This last item is that which gives the Well the right to be called such.

As has been urged elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> the adjustment of life which obtained

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 68 f.

<sup>2</sup> cf. *Elements of Ethics*, J. H. Muirhead.

<sup>3</sup> *New Introductory Lectures*, p. 141 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Revelation and the Unconscious*, R. Scott Frayn.

before the advent of consciousness must have been alien to anything like moral strife. It is consciousness which has disturbed that state and induced the conscientious scruple. The saying attributed to Carlyle, that he would rather be a man dissatisfied than a pig satisfied, reminds us of the stress engendered. With consciousness is born conscience. In an aspect of conscience with which we are all familiar, at all events, it does appear to function also from this mysterious region of the Unconscious. It operates so often *after* the event. It is so often what we call 'second thoughts'. The thing done, not condemned in consciousness at the moment or upon premeditation, some spectre rises up and calls us anything but blessed! It is not only after-thought but probably deeper-thought—suspected by Freud, it seems, of a divine origin.

That conscience is so allied with consciousness is also suggested when we speak of 'self-consciousness' in the sense of an infirmity. The term is commonly used to describe a confusion and embarrassment noticeable in very sensitive persons, even upon trivial occasions. In this respect it is such a commonplace and simple phenomenon as to suggest something in favour of the Common-sense school of thought, as it was called. As the other side of consciousness conscience is allied to a very common sense. The appeal 'from Philip drunk to Philip sober' is also relevant, since—if Philip be still a moral person—the return of consciousness will inevitably be the uncomfortable moment when conscience operates again. Nevertheless, we cannot forget how even in alcoholic mists and sullen stupors strange judgements have arisen which have changed the course of life. In sleep it is admitted that moral sense will soften and disguise. In the hypnotic trance 'the moral conscience' may show, and indeed maintain, 'resistance'.

We hold therefore that this persistent moral sense operates in both spheres of the mind, the Conscious and the Unconscious, from the very emergence of the former out of the latter. The inclusion in the mind of an interpreting, judicial and constructive factor is the inclusion of an element which is as unique and original as the mind itself, making that growing moral being which man is and ever must be.

R. SCOTT FRAYN

### THE INDIAN PROBLEM AND THE PRINCES

A GREAT deal of misunderstanding is abroad about the condition of affairs in India and no little harm is done by the misuse of terms. Everywhere men speak of Dominion Status as the goal of the present political aspiration in India, and by that is meant such a measure of freedom in government as is enjoyed by such Dominions as Canada and Australia, for instance. But the application of that conception takes no account of the immensely vaster problem, both as to numbers and variety of social and political ideas and obligations, not to mention religions, that makes the distinction of the subject to which the principle of Dominion Status is to be applied. The census just taken has revealed the fact that the population dealt with is 400 millions. The application

of representative government in the British India section of India has created deep cleavage on the communal question, Hindu and Moslem under the common umbrella of Congress being at issue over the treatment of minorities, a fatal lack of trust in the will to tolerate difference of opinion being revealed. But in addition to that there is the presence of the fact that cannot be ignored that a vast population, bordering on eighty millions, is under the rule of the great Indian Princes, and these have no such representative government at all, such as would correspond to anything suggested by the government of Canada or South Africa. In any final federal control of Indian affairs at the centre a vast problem is presented by the numerical proportion of the representatives of the Indian States as compared with those who represent the fifteen British India provincial governments. That which is represented differs in character and is provided for by different means. The one is personal and the other democratic. And the growth of the form of government towards democratic forms in the Native States is not to be thought of as something to be achieved by a leap. The great and magnificent states of Hyderabad, Mysore, Kashmir, Gwalior and Baroda, for instance, are not misgoverned or ill-governed, and the great Princes have come into their hereditary positions under assurances and treaties that must be scrupulously observed, for, as Lord Curzon said, speaking at Gwalior in 1899, the rulers of the States were his colleagues in government and partners in the administration of the country. Ten years later Lord Minto said that the foundation stone of Indian administration recognized the identity of the interests of the Imperial Government and the Durbars of the Princes, and that the very minimum of interference with the affairs of the Indian States would be the fixed policy of the Imperial Government. Lord Hardinge moved along the same line in discussing the foundation of a central college in Delhi in 1913, and in 1914 a new post in the Government was created for closer attention to be paid to the development of their mutual relations. In 1914 we found nearly 700 native princes and rulers backing the defences of the Empire, and contingents from twelve great states offered their help and it was accepted at once.

In December 1919 the King issued a royal proclamation establishing a Chamber of Princes, and the Duke of Connaught inaugurated it in February 1921. The proclamation has the following momentous statement, which needs to be kept in mind by all who interfere, or comment, on Indian affairs:

In my former proclamation I repeated the assurance given on many occasions by my Royal predecessors and myself, of my determination ever to maintain unimpaired the privileges, rights, and dignities of the Princes of India. The Princes may rest assured that this pledge remains inviolate and inviolable. I now authorize my Viceroy to publish the terms of the Constitution of the new Chamber. My Viceroy will take its counsel freely in matters relating to the Indian States generally, and in matters that affect these territories jointly with British India, or with the rest of my Empire. It will have no concern with the internal affairs of

the individual States, or their rulers, or with the relations of individual States to my Government, while the existing rights of the States and their freedom of action will be in no way prejudiced or impaired.

A special message of thanks was sent by the King to the Princes in acknowledgment of their splendid record in the war. H.H. the Maharaja of Bikaner sat in the Peace Conference and signed the Treaty of Versailles, and H.H. the Maharaja of Nawanagar attended the Geneva League of Nations Assembly.

With such facts as these to deal with, and with the loyal support of the Indian Princes and all they represent to have in hand, it is easy to predict that any Viceroy would work with the forces available, rather than stand helpless watching the quarrel of Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah. Provision for the safety both of India, and all its approaches, had to be made, and at once, and the coalescence of all sources of supply for military and naval affairs to be effected. Conferences of all leaders in the provision of military supplies had to be brought about and time spent, all too precious to be wasted with irresponsible disputants who seemed to have no proper sense of the gravity of the supreme issues of the hour. To make matters worse the premiers in five or six provincial governments flung down their portfolios and with a score of their ministers broke the law, and incited disloyalty, venturing to discourage recruiting. This furnished the enemies of Indian democratic government with a weapon to produce and use against the giving of anything like Dominion Status to India for a great time in the future. But the Viceroy and Government of Mr. Churchill has gone on with dogged determination and in company with the loyal provinces hoping for a change in the public mind, and they have invited some of the very ablest Indian men, as tested by experience and public service, to apply themselves to the problems that are presented in the ever changing events of this tremendous time. It is pernicious to suggest that the men selected are mere 'Yes men', as the vulgar aspersion puts it. No man would ever come to the centre of government in India who would be so crassly foolish, and it is to be remembered that it is the Viceroy in Council that takes this action—a Council to which the critics who use such language are not likely ever to come.

The one outstanding enigma to most people is the fact that Mr. Gandhi should be so allowed to dictate the policy of the Congress premiers and ministers in the provincial governments as to induce them to break the law, when they know that his pacifist and non-co-operation principles would render their own governments absolutely helpless in times of crisis, when tyranny and injustice need to be met by arms and heroes, who would never cease fighting till iniquity licked the dust and the arm of the oppressor be broken.

In any times such as those through which we are passing faults can be made by both sides in facing a situation calling for immediate action, but when the action must be taken, and is taken, loyalty to the common great cause should prevent Achilles from skulking in his tent.

For Troy has to be taken and Priam and his son dealt with. Hitlerism must be destroyed.

Meantime in loyal co-operation for the common cause a temper may easily be created that will make possible collaboration in forming an agreed government at the centre, while giving freedom to British Indian Provincial Governments, and resulting also in the enlargement of the degree of co-operation between the Princes and their people on a representative basis. The broadening of the basis of government in Mysore and its enlightened rule is augury of much.

JAMES LEWIS

### THE MESSAGE OF TAGORE<sup>1</sup>

THE beloved Indian poet is dead. He wrote of death long ago:

Now the day has dawned and the lamp that lit my dark corner is out.

A summons has come and I am ready for my journey.

He has a message for all who will read him and especially, perhaps, for those who, like himself, have known sorrow. Will his going turn us for a little to listen to it?

In the introduction to *Gitanjali*,<sup>2</sup> W. B. Yeats tells of a Bengali doctor who said to him: 'I read Rabindranath every day. To read one line of his is to forget all the troubles of the world.'

I confess to having put the book on a shelf and left it there for years, feeling after a glance that it was remote from ordinary life. Others may have done the same thing, but it is a pitiful mistake. His message is for the ordinary man and woman, bewildered and distracted, perhaps almost submerged, by the troubles of ordinary life. Our hearts respond to his words—they are so true—in a way we scarcely recognize, for as Mr. Yeats says: 'We had not known that we loved God, hardly, it may be, that we believed in Him.'

The songs are prose translations (if the lovely language can be called prose) by Tagore himself, from his Indian poetry, and the collection shows no very obvious arrangement—though a sort of continuity emerges later—so that at first they are best read each for its own sake.

There are some beautiful prayers, one or two of which are well known, but they all bear re-reading often, they carry so much in the perfect economy of their language:

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;

Where knowledge is free;

Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;

Where words come out from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted to Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Ltd. for permission to quote from Tagore's works.

<sup>2</sup> *Offerings of Song*, Macmillan.



Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;

Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action—

Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake.

And, for himself:

This is my prayer to thee, my lord—strike, strike at the root of penury in my heart.

Give me the strength lightly to bear my joys and sorrows.

Give me the strength to make my love fruitful in service.

Give me the strength never to disown the poor or bend my knees before insolent might.

Give me the strength to raise my mind high above daily trifles.

And give me the strength to surrender my strength to thy will with love.

Some of the songs are meditations on God and the struggle of life—these words, for instance, which speak of 'unanswered prayer':

My desires are many and my cry is pitiful, but ever didst thou save me by hard refusals; and this strong mercy has been wrought into my life through and through.

Day by day thou art making me worthy of the simple, great gifts that thou gavest to me unasked—this sky and the light, this body and the life and the mind—saving me from perils of overmuch desire.

A great sorrow of his own has given him deep understanding of the sorrowful and of grief itself. He says nothing to belittle suffering, but rather finds it to have, like everything else in life, a worthy purpose. Like Dante dreaming of Beatrice he says of his lost love: 'In seeking for her I have come to thy door,' and these words are to be found in C. F. Andrews' collection (*Thoughts from Tagore*, also published by Macmillan): 'Great sufferings lead us to wisdom because these are the birth-throes through which our mind is freed from its habit-environment, and comes naked into the arms of reality.'

Like all true mystics he is practical: to people who try to keep their children always 'dressed' he says: 'Mother, it is no gain, thy bondage of finery, if it keep one shut off from the healthful dust of the earth, if it rob one of the right of entrance to the great fair of common human life.' He sees the 'root of penury' in the heart of man, not in his circumstances. He has wise words for the over-tired:

In the night of weariness let me give myself up to sleep without struggle, resting my trust upon thee.

Let me not force my flagging spirit into a poor preparation for thy worship.

It is thou who drawest the veil of night upon the tired eyes of the day to renew its sight in a fresher gladness of awakening.

He returns again and again to a favourite theme—Time and the busy world:



I ask for a moment's indulgence to sit by thy side. The works that I have in hand I will finish afterwards.

Away from the sight of thy face my heart knows no rest nor respite, and my work becomes an endless toil in a shoreless sea of toil.

We who know the 'shoreless sea' would be wise to learn from him and ask for the 'moment's indulgence' more often.

Thy centuries follow each other perfecting a small wild flower.

We have no time to lose, and having no time we must scramble for our chances. We are too poor to be late.

The Bengali doctor referred to by Mr. Yeats explains the love of the Indian people for Tagore in this: 'He is the first among our saints who has not refused to live,' and his songs abundantly prove his love of life:

Deliverance is not for me in renunciation. I feel the embrace of freedom in a thousand bonds of delight. . . . I will never shut the doors of my senses. The delights of sight and hearing and touch will bear thy delight.

Yes, all my illusions will burn into illumination of joy, and all my desires ripen into fruits of love.

He knows his God is also the creator of all things, and he finds harmony in the idea. To him the world is a possible staircase to the spirit's better life, not a stumbling block to it. While he admits the value of 'the negative process of curbing desire and controlling passion' he denounces the type of renunciation that is 'only a shaking off of responsibility from one's own shoulders'. Over and over this message in various forms comes through his words: 'To be able to love material things, to clothe them with tender grace, and yet not be attached to them, this is a great service.' For him to fly from the world is as wrong as to look on it as an end in itself. For him, God is everywhere:

He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the pathmaker is breaking stones. . . . Meet him and stand by him in toil and in the sweat of thy brow.

And in looking forward to his own death the same thought comes: 'Because I love this life, I know I shall love death as well.'

But in all this he remonstrates only with himself, never forcing his opinion on his reader, always delicately guarding the right of every other to his own judgment: 'Deliverance is not for *me*—' for he knows how varied are the facets of the same truth, and never does he belittle the viewpoint of another. To him the meanest life is rare and he makes room for it in his own disarming humility.

It is hard to refrain from quoting much more, all full of the strangely Christian thought of this Eastern thinker, of his practical wisdom, his comfort and strength, and not least, his beauty of language. But is it necessary? The reader who would like to may find them for himself. I shall feel always that it was worth much to have found Rabindranath Tagore.

D. G. DOREY

## CHARLES ANDERSON SCOTT

LAST July New Testament scholarship lost one of the most brilliant biblical interpreters which the English-speaking world has known in the present century.

Charles Anderson Scott, born in 1858, was educated at Uppingham, where he became captain of the school, and went on to Cambridge with a scholarship at St. John's College. He was brought up by an uncle who attended the ministry of Dr. Alexander McLaren at Union Chapel, and many years ago one who was a fellow member of a young men's class at that church spoke in my hearing of the days when young Scott formed one of a group who studied the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius. One may be sure that in his case at any rate the reading of the author was not restricted to an English translation. Once when I asked him about this he recalled that stage of his boyhood, but told, with a twinkle in the eye and with that humorous chuckle that his friends knew so well, why his uncle transferred his membership from Union Chapel to the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Anderson, unlike his nephew, who kept a thick thatch to the end of his long life, was bald, and to the annoyance of the 'unco' guid' persisted in wearing a flamboyant smoking cap which was a conspicuous object in the middle pews near the front of the chapel. Their protests led to a change of ecclesiastical allegiance. This may have had important results in the career of the nephew. At any rate Charles Anderson Scott, after graduating in classics at Cambridge, went to New College, Edinburgh, following this up with semesters at Leipzig and Jena. In these years he laid the foundation of that sound biblical and theological scholarship upon which he built so worthily in later years.

Anderson Scott was no merely academic scholar. His heart was in the work of the ministry, and for some years he was minister first of the Presbyterian Church at Willesden, and later of the Church at Kensington. It was during his charge of the former that a young man of great promise was converted at a mission chapel under the care of the Willesden church. This was W. E. Orchard, whose strange spiritual pilgrimage has led him so far from this simple evangelical beginning—and yet not so far, for has he not himself told us that when he returned from the altar at which he had just been received into the Church of Rome he was singing in his heart the same Sankey chorus as when he knelt as a penitent in that mission room long years before? Dr. Anderson Scott took a keen interest in this young convert, and no doubt his influence had some shaping of the course which took Orchard to Westminster College, Cambridge. At this point it may be well to emphasize the deep sympathy which he felt for all true evangelism. He was fond of telling in later life how four scholars and theologians a few years ago were talking together about the deep things of life and all acknowledged that the springs of their inner life were opened during Moody's missions to Scotland in the early eighties.

In 1907 Dr. Anderson Scott was elected to the New Testament chair at Westminster College, where for twenty-five years he exercised a

powerful influence on successive generations of students. His standing in the University was shown by the fact that he was the first Nonconformist to be awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity when Cambridge abolished denominational tests for degrees in Theology. (Aberdeen some years earlier had conferred upon him an honorary D.D.) He was elected a member of the Theological Examining Board, and in 1929 was the first Nonconformist to be invited to deliver the Hulsean Lectures. In the preface to this book, *New Testament Ethics*, he refers to the cordiality with which the Tutors at the three Free Church theological colleges in Cambridge had been welcomed into partnership by the University. 'We have specially appreciated the opportunities which have been given to us by the Divinity Faculty of serving as members of the Faculty Board and of the Degree Committee, and as Examiners for the Tripos, and so taking our share in maintaining the tradition of sacred learning in the University.'

In 1932 he retired from his chair at Westminster College, but was glad to continue his connection by accepting the post of Librarian. His energies found happy scope as Chairman of the County Council sub-committee on religious education. He delighted in the opportunities thus given him to visit village schools throughout Cambridgeshire and to make friends with scores of teachers. His hand is also to be traced in both editions of the Cambridgeshire Syllabus of religious education for Schools. Perhaps the proudest year of his life came when, upon the sudden death of that inspiring teacher Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, the Divinity Faculty invited Dr. Anderson Scott to take his place and give the course of lectures for which Sir Edwyn had been responsible for some years. The veteran once more took down his armour, which had never been allowed to gather rust, and returned to active service. He was deeply moved by the eager enthusiasm of the students who flocked to his lectures.

As a writer Dr. Anderson Scott stands high in the ranks of New Testament scholarship. The first publication to attract wide attention was the book which appeared in 1901 under the title *Evangelical Doctrine Bible Truth*. This, in the guise of a series of imaginary letters to an Anglo-Catholic, is a courteous but devastating reply to Mr. Michael Sadler's then popular book, *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*. Almost the last book which came from his pen, *Romanism and the Gospel* (1937), returns to this affirmation of Protestant principles as inseparable from a competent study of the New Testament. The two attractive and altogether satisfying commentaries on the Book of Revelation in the *Century Bible* (1902) and in the *Devotional and Practical Commentary* (1906) established his reputation as an expositor of a high order. Then came some short articles in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, and *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, and some essays in composite volumes, one on 'Jesus and Paul' in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, and another, 'What happened at Pentecost?' in *The Spirit*. Two excellent contributions to New Testament Theology were *Dominus Noster* (1918) and *The Fellowship of the Spirit* (1921). Exegetical insight was shown again in the

exposition of 2 Corinthians in *Peake's Commentary* (1919) and of Romans in *The Abingdon Commentary* (1929). His magnum opus appeared in 1927, *Christianity according to St. Paul*. This fine treatment of the Pauline Theology was dedicated 'to the revered memory of my teachers, Thomas Anderson, Edward Thring, Andrew Bruce Davidson'. His uncle, his headmaster and the great Old Testament interpreter at New College, were thus linked in the grateful memory of his maturest years. Three small books published also by the Cambridge University Press to match his Hulsean Lectures are the fruit of his retirement and an abiding evidence of his desire to bring the Bible home to the heart of the unlearned. These are *Living Issues in the New Testament* (1933), *Foot-notes to St. Paul* (1935), and *St. Paul the Man and the Teacher* (1936). Finally we must mention the article 'Jesus Christ' in the 14th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1928). This is by no means a complete catalogue of his published writings and nothing has been said of many essays which the discerning student will search for in old volumes of the *Expository Times* and the *Expositor*. The characteristics that mark Dr. Anderson Scott's work are his thorough familiarity with all the best German and English works in his field of study, his complete independence of judgement, his freedom from prejudice combined with a refusal to be captivated by current fads and fancies of critical theory. A profound religious interest dominated all that he wrote.

Those who knew him best in the intimacy of personal friendship loved him for what he was as they admired him for what he knew. We think of him in his later years lying back in that folding chair, his short figure, his dark hair, his iron-grey beard, with eyes that sometimes twinkled with merriment and sometimes looked with penetrating gaze into the invisible realm. There as he lay he puffed clouds of smoke, now and again removing his pipe as he chortled with inward mirth or fired a shrewd question at his guest. He had troops of friends and loved to see them and to talk about the past, the present and the future. In a letter written not many months before his death he wrote: 'I am house-stuck for the present, and would be badly off but for a batch of very faithful friends, Bethune Baker, H. C. Carter, Flew and Raven, and our vicar who comes once a week. He has just written a book, and he and I are talking it over. Alas! I am cut off from libraries, unless I *know* what to order. Could you tell me *the* book on the Holy Spirit? Some time ago I heard Raven lecture on the "doctrine" of the Holy Spirit, striking into the subject at far too late a stage. What I want to know is, How did they (already in Galilee) recognize the presence of the Spirit in Jesus—and surrender to it? Have you come across Dodd's "the majesty of that meteoric career which is recorded for us in the Gospels"? "In the power of the Spirit." What a leap from "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from us", where O.T. experience reaches its climax! . . . I suppose you have heard or read of John Whale's lectures for the University and their extraordinary success—room packed so that he had to approach the platform over the desks—500 there, including two Divinity Professors. How men are thirsting for that Christian teaching which some Divinity dons studiously if not contemptuously ignore.'

But what can we say of the courtesy and charm of this great scholar? Only those who have had the privilege of receiving him often as a guest in their home know the humility and chivalry of this fine Christian gentleman. He being dead yet speaketh, for his books will live. Yet of Charles Anderson Scott it can truly be said that he was in himself greater than anything that he said or wrote. He was a man who walked with God, and who adorned the doctrine that he taught.

W. F. HOWARD

## HENRY WOOD NEVINSON

### A Knight of English Journalism

In the death of Henry Wood Nevinson a sturdy oak of English journalism has fallen. Sturdy, yes—in spite of a ripe old age; for the last shoot—a brief tribute to the genius of Thomas Hardy—put out within a few days of his death, had all the qualities of scholarly writing, independent thought and generosity of mind that made him the most distinguished war correspondent of his generation and placed him among the elect craftsmen of the Press.

Born at Leicester on October 11, 1856, he was the son of a solicitor with a good practice and the strongest evangelical convictions. H. W. Nevinson was nurtured in such a home as satirists of the Lytton Strachey school have frequently derided. Not so Nevinson. He was too deeply conscious of the debt he owed to that home, and of the vital part it played in the inner conflict by which his mind was tempered, to be other than appreciative. In the closing chapter of his autobiography—one of the best autobiographies in our language—he bore witness thus:

I have been happy in the opportunity of life. I was happy in being born to a grave and rigid manner of thought and behaviour; a condition poor enough to escape softness and luxury; but so far above the poverty line under which most people live that, with the help of scholarships, I could be sent to a great school and a great university.

The school was Shrewsbury, the university Oxford, where he read at Christ Church. He left with an exact knowledge of Greek, a passion for righteousness and a respect for tradition that gave an unusual distinction to his subsequent rebellion against all forms of injustice. After a period at Jena University, where he studied German military organization and laid the basis of a detailed acquaintance with the theory of war, he spent an invaluable six years in the School of Life popularly known as the East End of London. At Toynbee Hall he saw Whitechapel at first hand. He never forgot that experience. It inspired more than his well-known book, *Neighbours of Ours*, in which he portrayed the humour and pathos of the slums; it largely shaped his course, enlisting his pen—which, as someone has said, he wielded 'as the knights of old wielded their swords'—in many a desperate



adventure. Shrewsbury and Whitechapel—who shall say which had the greater influence in his life? For, as Mr. H. N. Brailsford has finely said: 'In his rebellion, he was never a rebel of the narrow type who believes that his country is always in the wrong. Rather it was for love of England that he revolted against many of the things done by English Governments . . . he was in revolt only because he had a finer sense for our traditional values than most of our rulers and teachers.' To quote Nevinson's own words in a tribute to H. W. Massingham, 'against "the insipid pattern of our civilization" he stood in lifelong rebellion'.

Ever chivalrous, he was always eager to plunge recklessly into the fight for the weak against the strong—often with his tall, spare body against the wall, he flashed the keen-edged rapier of his talent in defence of a cause that seemed without hope: for the Greeks against the Turks in 1896, when he tried to raise an English volunteer force; for the Russian peasants against the Tsar in the Moscow rising of 1905 (he described the opening of the first Duma for the *Westminster Gazette*); for the Spanish people in the Barcelona Revolution of 1909; for women's suffrage in 1910, when he resigned a lucrative post on the *Daily News* rather than abandon his championship of votes for women; for the common people of Germany during the occupation of Cologne; for the Irish during the 'Black-and-Tan' campaign and the civil war of 1922. During the heyday of his career he was to be found wherever the battle was most fierce; he served in eight wars and six rebellions, and reaped a grim harvest of tropical disease when investigating the slave trade in Central Africa. It was typical of him that he refused to ignore his former friend, Roger Casement, at a time when many who had praised the Irishman joined in the chorus of condemnation. Nevinson was no fair-weather friend, either of a nation or an individual. Like 'Don Roberto', whom he resembled in nobility both of appearance and of style, he could be counted upon to the end.

His mind fed in youth upon the legends of the ancient world and the writings of Goethe, Carlyle and Ruskin. He enjoyed the friendship of Meredith and Hardy, William Morris, Wilfred Scawen Blunt and Edward Carpenter. As a journalist he ranked with the greatest—Russell of *The Times*, H. W. Massingham of the *Daily Chronicle*, C. P. Scott and C. E. Montague of the *Manchester Guardian*. Massingham, whom he served on the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Nation*, wrote thus of him:

Some of his attributes may seem singular or even a little contradictory of each other. For example, there is a Zeal-for-Peace Nevinson and a Smite-to-Slay Nevinson, living apparently on excellent terms with each other; and a professor of Socialism at no visible odds with an ardent Nietzschean, sworn foe of that 'cold monster', the State. But there are antinomies of the mind, and Nevinson is of the favoured race for whom there are no rules but those of the spirit. He has had a most romantic career, full of perils, battles, stratagems, and temporal triumphs and disappointments. All of it can be spiritually grouped under his favourite Goethe's ideal of 'resolute living in all things good, true, and beautiful'.



In the intervals of peace, home from the wars, he proved himself to be an accomplished essayist, biographer of Goethe, reviewer and leader writer. For a while he edited the most famous of all literary pages—Massingham's cherished feature in the *Chronicle*. After H. W. M. had been deposed from that throne, Nevinson wrote Middles—aptly described by Mr. H. M. Tomlinson as discourses on subjects 'that had some interest in the news'—for his weekly kingdom, the *Nation*. Many of his papers are reprinted in *Essays in Freedom and Rebellion and Between the Wars*. They reveal not only the magnanimity of a mind richly stored in the best classical literature but also a living acquaintance with the Bible. In a discussion of style he wrote: 'The formless mind produces the formless style. The beautiful thought cannot exist apart from the beautiful form; and you might as well seek to graft a thing called good style upon a rotten, slovenly, cowardly, or insensitive nature as to gather grapes of thorns.' Much of the secret of his own achievement shines through those words.

Mr. Tomlinson said of him that 'in no more than the uniform of a war correspondent he appeared . . . more like a general commanding than most generals do'. A master of the arts of battle, in later years he proclaimed, as every civilized man must, 'a humane horror' of war; yet he would shrink from no sacrifice to defeat tyranny and injustice. He loved tradition, but freedom even more; his pen, that could not be bought, was always freely at the service of the oppressed. He would have said of his whole life, as he said of his childhood: 'Mine was far from dull, far from unhappy.' He could endure hardship as a good soldier and put aside ease wherever principle conflicted with self-interest. His epitaph perhaps should be the verse of Walter Savage Landor's with which he prefaced the one-volume edition of his *Changes and Chances*:

I strove with none, for none was worth my strife.

Nature I loved, and, next to Nature, Art:

I warm'd both hands before the fire of life;

It sinks, and I am ready to depart.

Ready! That describes the man—always ready for the next adventure, and not least ready for the greatest adventure of all.

RICHARD G. BURNETT

## Editorial Comments

### THE TRAGEDY OF JAPAN

The treacherous attack of December 7th has brought upon the Japanese the condemnation of all decent people. To make war whilst one is still talking peace is to be guilty of an infamy which cannot be excused. It may, however, be explained, though the roots of such explanation will have to be found in the distant past. Whilst the immediate instrument of the infamy is the militarist caste in Tokio, the attitude itself was not born recently in Berlin; it began in a far-off yesterday in Japan.

Twice in the course of their strange history the Japanese have emerged from obscure isolation, and taken part of two civilizations to themselves. In the first place they assimilated the splendour of outward ceremonial from the Chinese in the sixth century, and, long afterwards, at the end of the nineteenth century, they began to imitate the factors which made for material prosperity in Europe. Unfortunately they did not realize that fine clothes do not feed the soul. Their imitation of non-essentials was careful and exact but it was pagan. The gods were chained to the soil of Nippon. Japan was heaven; its destiny was all that mattered.

In spite of the development of much that was interesting and might have been beneficial in the years between, the nation has reached the present hour with the characteristics of a Narcissus. Self-worship has led to the denial of all the wider social obligations. Japan, like Germany, has deliberately placed herself outside the family of nations. The ferocity of her nationalism has become madness. It has been 'exaggerated to the point of insanity'.

Before totalitarianism comes to this pass it is forced to develop a philosophy or a pseudo-religion. As Sir Richard Livingstone has said: 'The State can keep order, organize, administer. . . . It can provide a body, but not a soul. It has no philosophy of the good life.' So it must set out on a search for which it has little aptitude and no heart. It is driven by the force of sheer necessity. The people must be provided with something which will appeal to their religious instincts, yet which shall remain completely subservient to the State. Such a 'religion' can thus become a powerful driving-force sending the masses into battle with the fanaticism of a false ideal. In Japan this has been discovered in an adaptation of Shintoism. Primitive mythology has been grafted on to an extravagant nationalism. In saying this one must be careful to distinguish between religious Shinto and State Shinto. The latter development, directed by the Home Office, is now the driving-force behind the Japanese people. In the words of H. G. Chirgwin, 'it aims to keep up the national morale by inculcating reverence to the ancestors, by proclaiming the good of the State to be the supreme objective, and by exalting the Emperor both as the representative of the country and as the divine descendant of the Sun Goddess'. Through the 'divinity' of the Emperor the people, themselves, claim some share in the divine prerogatives.

This situation has created a new threat to the Christian communities in Korea and occupied China, as well as in Japan. For some time Korean Christians have been compelled to attend State Shinto ceremonies at the local shrines. The order has been given to them ostensibly as Japanese subjects. They have been assured that such shrines are national and not religious, but the native Korean pastors have been driven to lay twigs from the sacred fir-trees on these 'national' altars. Every Japanese knows that the slip of paper bearing the sacred name of the Sun Goddess has already been deposited in the shrine. The bow which must be made at the shrine is the symbol of a subtle blend of crude primitive religion and the all-important nationalism. The Emperor is the direct descendant of the Sun Goddess, and at the same time the supreme head of the State. The religious instincts of the Japanese peasant may thus be satisfied, at the very moment when he is pledging his whole being to the service of the State. His worship becomes self-worship. He is part of this tragic Narcissus which does not acknowledge the existence of those principles which are essential to the peaceful well-being of humanity as a whole. In a remarkable article on the 'tribalism' of Japan, Mr. A. Wilson, writing in the *Spectator*, concludes: 'Now, while Germans are in their hearts well aware of the nature of these principles, the Japanese are not, and in several senses cannot be, since the very notion of universal criteria is foreign to them: in a word, the Germans are relapsed Christians, while the Japanese have never known what Christianity may be.'

These words contain an indictment of the quality of much that has passed for Christianity and a challenge to those who have condemned or limited the missionary enterprise of the Christian Church. The tragedy of Japan might have been averted yesterday. Its effect on the world must be ended to-day, and to-morrow—? There lies the responsibility and the opportunity of the Christian democracies.

#### THE JAPANESE AS CHRISTIANS

In an hour when man's sense of all that is honourable and decent has been so brutally outraged in the Pacific it is natural that wild generalizations should have been made. Perhaps it is too early to expect a more balanced judgement to emerge. The threat to all that we hold dear is deadly, and we are scarcely inclined to allow any exceptions to temper our sweeping condemnations. Nevertheless it is wholesome, even now, to remember the attitude of others who also have suffered.

Here are the words of Kagawa in his calendar last year: 'Dear Brothers and Sisters in China: Though a million times I should ask pardon it would not be enough to cover the sins of Japan, which cause me intolerable shame. I ask you to forgive my nation. And there are an uncounted number of young souls in Japan who, like myself, are asking for pardon. I beg you to forgive me, especially because we Christians were not strong enough to restrain the Militarists. Forgive us as we work and pray that the day will come when our two nations will be harmonious in the name of Christ.'

There is something in these words which State Shinto could not produce. He who wrote them, like an earlier apostle, has suffered bonds and imprisonment for his faith. Whilst his fanatical fellow-countrymen lay waste the islands of the sea, he toils amongst tubercular-ridden islanders with whom he has found the service which is perfect freedom! The devil which possesses men must and will be exorcised, but the house, empty, swept and garnished must be possessed again by the angels which wait to garrison the soul of Everyman. Kagawa checks our angry and defeatist generalizations. He stands in sublime contrast to so many of his fellows. In him we see what might be.

### CHRISTIANITY IN CHINA

The brutal struggle which was forced on China more than four years ago seemed as though it could have no outcome save blood and tears. Certainly it looked as though the Christian Church must be overwhelmed. So it appeared to the Christian community in Rome long ago. So it must appear to the little groups of the faithful in Manchukuo to-day. Yet China is providing an amazing object-lesson which the faint-hearted might well study.

Whilst the Nazi leaders by the creation of the so-called 'German Christian' movement have sought to hoodwink sincere Christians in the service of the State, subordinating their Christianity to its soulless control, there have been many Niemöllers. Though Japan has similarly proclaimed the establishment of the 'Japanese Protestant Church' formed by 'patriots' and prepared to dispense with such parts of the Bible as do not accord with national policy, there remains Kagawa—with his 'uncounted' associates. In China the position has been entirely different for the obvious reason that the ideal of democratic freedom admits the existence of a Christianity whose supreme authority is outside and above the State. In an interesting description of the position, the *New York Herald Tribune* has the following passage: 'The Chinese are using this war as a kind of purge to clean out all that is corrupted in China. They are building a new nation. . . . Christianity has become a most important religion in China. The Chinese Christians are uncompromising in their religion and are doing things which we never dream of doing. They have been instructed by their leaders not to hate or be bitter against the Japanese. Japanese prisoners are treated like guests and are allowed to marry and settle in free China.' For a moment one is inclined to gasp at this statement. Is it a sign of weakness or quixotism, or is it—but the record of the loyalty, courage and endurance of the Chinese Christians these last four years silences such a possibility. They are showing the very qualities which will bring the totalitarian peoples to their knees, and showing them, with such chivalry, that they might at last kneel a second time and for a better purpose. They are fighting—but for the kind of peace which has been well defined as 'goodwill effectively maintained against every form of greed'.

## CO-OPERATION

Events are driving the free nations of the world into a closer co-operation than they have ever known. Whatever difficulties have to be overcome in establishing unity of command will have no unpleasant consequences if we can remember Lincoln's words, before he became President: 'As I would not be a slave so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy.'

Something more than immediate necessity is bringing the peoples together. It may be they see but dimly the vision of their common destiny, but they are recognizing it more distinctly than ever before. Ten years ago, for example, the firm of J. K. Smit and Sons began to publish a *Quarterly World Review*. Since the invasion of Holland it has been published in the United States of America. Its founder went into voluntary captivity when the German armies so brutally overran his country. His son, realizing his father's ideals, has issued the *Review* in spite of all difficulties. 'It is a sincere attempt', he says, 'to contribute towards the bringing more closely together those who believe firmly in the power of good over evil.' In describing the delight with which his father used to write, he says: 'With every new issue he was brought a little nearer to his ideal of peace and to a fellowship of men in which violence has no place.' As he sat at his desk, busy on such a task, the German invaders approached. He refused to escape! In the remarkable number of the *Review* which his son has published there are contributions from France, Belgium, Holland, Finland, Denmark, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, as well as from Britain and the United States. In the preface is this sentence: 'We are convinced that we cannot do without each other: not because you are Americans and, we Dutchmen or Englishmen, but purely and simply because we are "men", free men with traditions that do not clash, with expectations that run parallel; you and we together want to help our fellow men and, if their minds have been poisoned, we want to cure and nurse them.' One of the Belgian contributors writes: 'Besides, never before have Belgians, including the Flemings and Walloons, felt so strongly that the future demands their collaboration and unity. It is under this banner that a small nation will be born again in a great Europe.' The Editor concludes with this sentence: 'Eventually all those who are now fettered will be restored to freedom, and when that moment comes, peace and goodwill will reign supreme as a result of the concentrated efforts and unshakable ideals of thousands and millions like ourselves in the countries of free thought.' That is a vision which the rulers of Germany, Italy, and Japan have not seen, nor yet desired to see. Its realization will come in the still closer co-operation of free peoples everywhere.

THE EMPTY ROOM<sup>1</sup>

The new book by Charles Morgan is described as 'his first experiment in the *conte*'. It is now sixteen years since the publication of his first

<sup>1</sup> *The Empty Room*. By Charles Morgan. (Macmillan & Co. 5s. net.)



work, *My Name is Legion*. The short novel which has just appeared is only the eighth which he has written in that period. Though it is short it marks a further development in technique and a sharper definition of the writer's philosophy. *The Empty Room*—the title is taken from 'Abt Vogler'—is a delicate and subtle study of regeneration. It is not escapist literature. The superficial reader will feel that there are no long and hazardous journeys in this book. What action there is occurs in a small country house. The author demands quiet thoughtfulness, considerable imagination and what I think he would call singleness of mind in those who read this slender volume. Those who are prepared to bring such qualities to their reading may discover they have set out on a longer journey than they thought. They will find themselves on a great and perilous adventure of the spirit, for this book is concerned with the final testings of faith. In so doing they may discover that they have 'escaped' after all, for they will pass from appearance to reality, from the cold and stiff array of facts to the wonder of the ideas behind them.

The chief character, Henry Rydal, is a man 'who still believes in the regeneration of mankind'. Though he knows the horrors of war—has, indeed, been a prisoner of war—he is able to concentrate on writing a legal history because of this unswerving faith. 'The idea of regeneration dominated Rydal's life, and nothing so certainly moved his gentle but abrupt nature to resistance as a denial of it.' He is more interested in the ideas behind action than in the action itself. So, even the possibility of a successful invasion does not alter his idea of the English people. 'He doesn't claim that they are invincible. . . . Only that they are immortal. The Continuing People—not the English only, the French too, the Americans also, all free peoples; it is the absence of the will to liberty that kills—men, nations, women.' His faith is tested, not so much by the evacuation of Dunkirk as by the desertion of his wife, yet there is no fear as to the result. Her apparent disloyalties, her outward coarsening, her final attempt to ease him of embarrassment by a second flight—none of these things break down his faith because none break down his love. There is his secret but it is hidden behind a thousand delicate veils. 'You "forgive" a stranger, not a woman you love; I have always loved her. Love includes forgiveness of every wrong before it is committed—before, after, at all times'.

As Henry Rydal faces his own intimate problem he is able to understand the greater problems of a world at war. 'This, if you come to think of it', he says, 'is much nearer to being a religious war than an economic one, and no one expects much for himself out of a religious war. . . . There aren't any rewards at all except a chance to replant.' In such an attitude he meets his personal difficulties, without fear or any kind of self-interest, and with unshaken faith.

His wife, Venetia, is by contrast a pitifully tragic figure yet, in spite of all her outward defeats, she is supremely conscious of his love. Her portrait, painted when she was very young, perhaps twenty-two or twenty-three years old, showed in her eyes 'a vitality—of what? Not precisely of alarm, for their expression was tranquil—of wonder, then,



of taking nothing for granted, of having heard, amid the timeless delight of being young, an approaching footstep'. Her daughter, Carey, so strangely like her 'and yet, though her youth also heard the approaching footstep and was alive with the knowledge of it, she, unlike the girl in the portrait, heard it with a quiet mind'. It would be futile to attempt to describe, still less to interpret, the happenings when Venetia returns from the far country to the faith and love of Henry and the perplexed Carey. Even the shrewd discernment of Richard Cannock, the great surgeon, fails to diagnose the situation and to discover the way out. Nothing less than love could accomplish it, and few writers of to-day could lead us so gently but so surely to the heart of it as does Charles Morgan.

With extreme care and absolute fidelity he maintains his theme. His language is simple, sincere, beautiful, without arrogance and with no danger of ever becoming 'precious'.

In spite of all its subtleties the book is strong and triumphant. The mother, conscious of her shame, cannot believe her child will love her. 'Venetia shook her head. "Carey love me?" "Not what you appear to be. What you are," was her husband's answer. "Henry—dear, dear Henry—isn't that just words? The hard-boiled people would say so, and they are in a fair way towards ruling the world."

"Towards appearing to rule the appearances of the world," he answered. "They have never yet succeeded in doing more than that. What they crucify always rises from the dead."

#### THE REFRESHMENT OF RECOLLECTION<sup>1</sup>

Anything which can lessen the effect of war's hardening processes on the soul of man may be counted a benediction. Strangely enough, the saga of one's own childhood plays such a part—when one can recall it. To be able to see again those first adventures, to feel the thrill of early triumphs and to remember the problems which terrified us then but which would amuse us now—to view in new perspective the first stages of our pilgrimage is to be able to measure our progress. The memory of an earlier generation was quickened by *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and Judge Hughes helped many a man to recover his boyhood and, in the process, to recover his manhood also. For a similar reason we welcome the publication of *The Jeremy Stories*, by Sir Hugh Walpole. To the jaded man whose spirit is hardening in the third year of war it would be a tonic to remember his boyhood. Let him read *Jeremy*, *Jeremy and Hamlet*, and *Jeremy at Crale*, and he will be drawing parallels in his own life. If he take Walpole as his guide he will not shed mawkish tears, nor fear approaching senility. He will discover that sturdy growth of independence and sanity which will refuse to surrender to the boredom or the disillusionment of war.

There is a universal quality in *Jeremy* which makes its instant appeal. We felt like this or that—or at any rate we like to think we did. The house, the pride of family, the dawn of religion, the rebellions, mistakes and peccadilloes, the dreams, the fights, the gradual struggle to one's

<sup>1</sup> *The Jeremy Stories*. By Hugh Walpole. (Macmillan & Co. 8s. 6d. net.)

feet—all these things come back. It may not have been Polchester but it was our town, our house, our soul! It seems, as one reads *Jeremy*, as though Hugh Walpole held a magic mirror which shows us ourselves yesterday—but we are permitted to use the mirror in the privacy of our own rooms. Nobody knows, we think, that we were like that!

We lied—like *Jeremy*—and, upon my soul, we felt like *Jeremy* about it:

‘Nevertheless, his desolation was supreme. He was a liar. He had told lies before but they had not been discovered, so they were scarcely lies. Now, in some strange way, the publication of his book had shown him what truly impossible things lies were. He had witnessed this effect upon the general public; he had not believed that he was so wicked. He did not even now feel really wicked, but he saw quite clearly that there was one world for liars and one for truthful men. He wanted, terribly badly, someone to tell him that he was still in the right world.’

We argued with an uncle, or our own conscience, and came to the same casuistical conclusions:

“‘I am very good at obeying,” explained *Jeremy*, “if someone says something; but if someone doesn’t there isn’t anyone to obey.”

Our primitive beliefs began as *Jeremy*’s began, and when we see them in this mirror of our boyhood, we are ashamed that sometimes still, we have been acting as though we had not grown up at all:

‘Schoolboys believe in nothing save what they can see with their own eyes and are told by other boys physically stronger than themselves.’

There is sheer joy in the recollections *Jeremy* brings back. We, too, remember a bus—like Collins’ bus—and in the clamour of a speed-ridden world it is a pleasant memory:

‘The drive through the streets was, of course, as lovely as it could be; not in the least because anyone could see anything—that was hindered by the fact that the windows of the bus were so old that they were crusted with a kind of glassy mildew, and no amount of rubbing on the window-panes provided one with a view—but because the inside of the bus was inevitably connected with adventure—partly through its motion, partly through its noise, and partly through its lovely smell. . . . As for the smell it was that lovely well-known one that had in it mice and straw, wet umbrellas and whisky, goloshes and candle-grease, dust and green paint! *Jeremy* loved it, sniffed on this occasion so often that Miss Jones told him to blow his nose.’

If we did not know the Dean’s wife in Polchester, we can chuckle over the lady, so like her, whom we certainly did know:

She was thick and hard, like a wall, and wore the kind of silken clothes that rustled—like the whispering of a whole meeting of frightened clergymen’s wives—as she moved.

In this unconscious re-creation of our boyhood, Sir Hugh Walpole, like Charles Dickens, personifies familiar things. When we were children they seemed alive. As you ran down the street at night you felt, like Jeremy, that 'the lamp-posts ran up to you as though they were going to knock you down', and 'the stars crackled and spluttered and trembled overhead'. Long ago there was a night when, after a crisis that seemed final, we 'went slowly up to bed . . . stopped for a moment in the dark passage thinking. The whole house was silent . . . only the clocks whispering'.

It was a strange world, but very real to Jeremy and to us. In this still more preposterous world in which we live, one is apt to wander disconsolately, like Jeremy's dog, with 'the lead trailing behind him like a neglected conscience'. To escape for a moment to our beginnings is a relief, and maybe a refreshing. That is what it seemed to me as I wandered with Jeremy and Hamlet through my own boyhood. In that repeated pilgrimage I found there was something which has endured. In the next stage it may help me more. That discovery is a debt I owe to Hugh Walpole—and to Jeremy.

### SHORT STORIES<sup>1</sup>

Short stories are a blessing to overstrained men and women in war-time. Here are two volumes, published by Messrs. John Murray, which will help you to recover your balance!

The first is by a professor of history who served in India, France, and Mesopotamia in the last war. Afterwards, in spite of tempting offers to remain in the Indian Educational Service, H. T. W. Bousfield became a business man in London. With such a background—Cambridge, the North-West Frontier, the glamorous Orient and the hustling City life—he can be trusted to give us stories fantastic and mysterious, hard-boiled and grim. In this collection, called *Vinegar and Cream*, he does it all so neatly. The vinegar is not too sour, nor the cream too rich. The stories are clever without any sense of strain. The style is direct, at times colloquial, and the author interprets our weaknesses with considerable tolerance. The tale of 'The Unselfish Mother' is modern enough, but it reveals age-old characteristics with humour and understanding. These stories are just the thing for a well-earned hour of idleness. They rest you!

The other volume is the last published work of P. C. Wren. Many of us will regret his passing for, in *Beau Geste* and its successors, we found retreat that helped to fit us for the next adventure. In all his stories, so romantic and colourful, there is a wholesome, full-blooded sense of endeavour which few modern fiction-writers achieve. The present book is in the true Wren tradition. Drama and melodrama, mystery and thrills, laughter and tears—all this and much more—adventure on sea and land, and, sometimes, a peep into a deeper struggle within the human heart. For this last book, as for those which have gone before, one is grateful. It is good, honest relief from the psycho-analytical pessimists who have plagued us too long.

<sup>1</sup> *Vinegar and Cream*. By H. T. W. Bousfield. (John Murray, 8s. 6d.) *Odd but Even So*. By P. C. Wren. (John Murray, 7s. 6d.)

## MINISTERS IN COUNCIL TO OUR READERS

### *An Explanation and an Appeal*

The severe restriction on our paper supply makes it inevitable that we should reduce the size of *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, and that we should, for the time being, set it in smaller type. Since we must reduce our paper to 21½ per cent of our normal requirements, it is only by making these changes that we can continue publication. We feel confident that our readers will understand and accept the situation. We are convinced it would be wrong to suspend the *Review*. It fulfils a certain function at present, and, we believe, has an important task to discharge in the post-war world. During this period of great difficulty we appeal, with confidence, for your loyal support.

THE EDITOR

## *Ministers in Council*

At recent meetings of Ministers' Groups topics have been discussed which may prove suggestive to members of other circles or for fraternal conversations.

THE NEW TESTAMENT 'KOINONIA'. The Rev E. T. Wood, M.A., in an all too brief but most stimulating survey, at a meeting of Lincoln ministers, of the significance of Fellowship in its Biblical usage drew attention to the predominantly active sense of the word in Scripture. In the New Testament it seemed to him that the word referred not to a state but to an activity. Hence he could not but feel that our conventional rendering of 'fellowship' is misleading. There are so-called church fellowships which are, for most of their members, purely passive and receptive, and it is challenging to be recalled from such examples of sponge-like absorption of instruction or influence and to be confronted with the original conception in the Epistles and elsewhere of a virile, energetic partnership. The vital, active quality of any New Testament Fellowship is always pronounced and is never unilateral.

This idea has since received considerable confirmation from an examination of the forty-odd New Testament passages containing either the noun 'koinonia' or the cognate adjective and verb as collected by Dr. Vincent Taylor in a valuable section on 'Fellowship' in his recent *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.). Though he does not himself specifically deal with this phase of interpretation, the material there brought together lends point to the contention. The terms, Dr. Taylor states, are not derived from distinctively religious sources but from general usage, and in non-Biblical literature are applied to partnership in business, in marriage, or in pagan worship. The active sense is thus attached to any one of the fellowship-words

before it is borrowed by Christian speech or writing. In the New Testament it is found in a secular association with reference to the partnership of boatmen engaged in fishing where mutual effort would be continuous and strenuous. In an evil setting it describes the complicity of murderers. With a purely spiritual reference the term is used of Titus as a willing and enthusiastic colleague in missionary labours; to believers in various localities busied in contributing amongst themselves to the relief of needy brethren; and to friends of Paul who by their sympathy and service shared with him in his troubles.

A very significant and telling passage in this connection is Gal. ii. 19, where Paul relates how those who were reputed to be pillars gave to him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship. We to-day in a reception of new members speak of giving the right hand of fellowship. But our modern use of the phrase may be pallid and tame. As employed by Paul, however, it tingled with life, denoting mutual recognition of, and implying fresh dedication to, zones of arduous toil for the Kingdom.

If there is such a stir and throb in the New Testament use of the word when thinking of the relation of Christian with Christian, there is also movement and colour when the New Testament writers take the word to denote the connection of the saint with his Saviour. Then it bespeaks a communion of thought, a mutuality of feeling and concord in effort. Christians are now already partakers in the divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4) as they will be hereafter in the fullness of the heavenly glory (1 Pet. v. 1). If Christ is to-day being crucified afresh by the wanton sins of men, then in His present sufferings, His true followers are partakers (1 Pet. iv. 10), having fellowship with Him in carrying His cross. And this pain is a fellowship not in word only but in an inward urge which is redemptive. As Dr. Vincent Taylor reminds us: 'The New Testament teaches that the one true hope of communal fellowship bears, and must bear, the sign of the Cross.'

\* \* \* \* \*

**THE CURE OF SOULS.** In another Ministers' Group this subject was being a short while ago earnestly discussed and particularly as to personal dealing. How can we win the confidence of our people so that naturally and freely they will talk to us of the deeper spiritual realities? When a soul in difficulties unloads its burdens upon us, how may we know the right line to take? How can we exercise a fruitful ministry with the individual? These were some of the questions raised. And one of the youngest and then one of the oldest present each said: 'My college course did not help me toward this.'

Each generation has apparently to face a recall to the one-by-one method. Henry Drummond read a paper before the Theological Society of the New College, Edinburgh, in November 1873, on 'Spiritual Diagnosis' (published by Hodder & Stoughton in *The New Evangelism*). In it he said: 'The capacity of acting upon individuals is now almost a lost art. . . . The men to whom you or I would go if spiritual darkness spread across our souls, who are they? . . . Plenty there are to preach to



us, but who will interview us . . . and lay us bare to God's eye and our own?' So Drummond wrote in 1873. A little over twenty years later, this testimony was borne on his passing: 'He received . . . more of the confidences of people untouched by the ordinary work of the Church than any other man of his time. Men and women came to him in their deepest and bitterest perplexities.'

Now in *The Evangelism for Our Time* (Epworth Press, 2s.) the Rev. F. C. Spurr is powerfully, urgently pleading for this personal dealing as The First and the Last Way in all methods of true and successful evangelism. 'It is with sick souls as with sick bodies. Each demands its own diagnosis. . . . Individual work must supplement public teaching and preaching.' He quotes Bossuet as saying: 'It requires more faith and courage to say two words face to face with a single sinner, than from the pulpit to rebuke two or three thousand people.'

\* \* \* \* \*

'A RELIGION FOR BATTLE DRESS.' Under this title the Rev. Ronald Sinclair, M.C., C.F., Canon of Chester, has published (Mowbray, 2s. 6d.) addresses given by him at the Royal Army Chaplains' Department Reception Centre to some 450 chaplains who came in batches from all Protestant churches for fortnightly courses of preparation before joining their units. They were given extempore and taken down in shorthand. Ten Talks in easy, frank fashion are here reproduced. Some of the titles are antithetic, as Bridges or Piers? Parlour or Cellar? The Body: Master or Servant? Love of Power or Power of Love? Pinnacle or Cross? Friendship or Reputation? The series also includes discourses on: Is not this the Carpenter? Why did Jesus choose the Cross? He is Risen: Where is He to be found and How shall we pray?

Whilst of course primarily intended for padres on active service, there is much of value for us all in wartime. The speaker was in the army as a combatant in the last war, and since he had thus been 'brought face to face with naked reality' he gained a 'religion stripped of all its accretions, of ecclesiasticism . . . a religion of the kit bag as distinct from the religion of the church building'.

The first chapter on 'Bridges or Piers' points out a danger and stresses an ideal. 'The danger in our ministry is that we shall just be piers jutting out from one side of the gulf, but never reaching to the other side.' On the one hand, we may be piers in the sense that we are 'rooted and grounded in the love of humanity, we may be hail-fellow-well-met, good mixers . . . men among men. We may be all that . . . and yet be complete washouts as regards our job, because we are not bridges but piers. We are attached to the human.' On the other hand some may be 'piers from the other side of the gulf. . . . They are at home in the things of the Spirit but, somehow or other, they never get all that which men need so badly, across. . . . They are never understood by the common man. They talk a language which he doesn't understand. . . . They are not bridges; they are just piers.' Neither to be worldly nor to be ecclesiastical, but to be bridges: that is the aim. 'Through our souls as a bridge



there should pass . . . men's needs . . . up into the divine . . . and the divine grace, passing again through us and making contact with the men whom we are privileged to serve.'

In this unpretentious but provocative book of some ninety pages there is much to stir thought and prayer.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE DISINTERESTEDNESS OF RICHARD BAXTER. Our reference in the last issue of the *Review* to Baxter has brought a very kind message from the Rev. J. T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., author of the valuable edition of *The Reformed Pastor* published by our Bookroom. Mr. Wilkinson also adds the interesting note that Baxter, whilst virtually vicar of Kidderminster, refused the actual vicariate, preferring to remain as a Puritan lecturer. Under the law of the Long Parliament, parishioners could petition against an unworthy incumbent and seek for his removal. But if the incumbent agreed to the appointment of a lecturer he might still retain the living. Thus at Kidderminster the incompetent vicar, George Dance, retained the living and the vicarage and read the services, whilst Baxter preached the sermon and took the pastoral work. Hence, though virtually vicar and doing the essential and difficult work of the parish, Baxter refused the emoluments of the parish, lest he should seem to be grasping in the stress of unhappy circumstances.

The Rev. J. T. Wilkinson has made all matters pertaining to Baxter his own especial field and one hopes that he may yet be prevailed on to give us further fruit of his rich knowledge of one whose life and work have so many points of contact with our modern ministries.

\* \* \* \* \*

I shall be glad to receive further reports and also comments on any subject suitable for these columns.

W. E. FARNDALE

10 Mainwaring Road,  
Lincoln

## Recent Literature

*The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment.* By R. H. Strachan.  
(S.C.M. 10s. 6d.)

Professor Strachan has made his reputation by a number of books of a kind which are valued alike by students and by preachers. This is the third book which he has written about the Gospel according to St. John. The first was a little book written during the last war and published in 1917. The second appeared in 1925 under the title *The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian?* The latest book has the same title as the first, but it is entirely re-written, and it supersedes its namesake altogether. Without hesitation we should recommend this as the best interpretation, short of a full-dress commentary, which the English reader will find for his study of this difficult Gospel.

The introduction puts the reader in a position to survey the religious world in which this Gospel found its first readers. Questions of construction and authorship are handled with candour and sound judgement. It is interesting to see that Dr. Strachan has abandoned his earlier theory of composite authorship, recognizing in this Gospel a literary unity, and he no longer isolates certain portions as editorial revisions or insertions. He gives fair consideration to the theory of accidental displacements, though he is not convinced by the arguments brought forward. On some points one may venture to differ from his conclusions. Thus, before accepting Dr. Moffatt's linguistic arguments for attributing chapter xxi to a different author he might consider the damaging criticism to which that rather loose statement has been subjected. On p. xi 'Cohen's edition' of Philo is presumably Cohn and Wendland's standard edition of the Greek text, though why C. D. Yonge's translation should be preferred to that by Colson and Whitaker is not stated. Two slight printer's errors in the footnotes on pp. 243 and 285 will cause no perplexity, but it might be well to state that the passage referred to as occurring in the Palestinian Talmud (*Yoma* 43<sup>c</sup>) is also found in the Babylonian Talmud (*Yoma* 39<sup>b</sup>).

All the qualities that one has learnt to expect in Dr. Strachan's work are to be found here in rich profusion. His wide learning and exact scholarship, his literary interests which bring so often illustration from modern poetry, or essays, or books of travel, his keen insight into spiritual truth so that the reader is never allowed to miss the essential message while following critical discussions, and a style which makes the reading of the book a pleasure, all combine to give distinction to a book which is both popular and profound. Those who have long been convinced that the once conventional treatment of this Gospel as un-historical in the deeper sense of the term will not stand the test of modern enquiry will rejoice to read in the preface, 'Further study has convinced me of the supreme value of this Gospel as an authentic interpretation of the self-consciousness of Jesus Christ, and of the contribution it makes to our knowledge of the events of His ministry,

particularly of the story of the Passion.' At the same time Dr. Strachan frankly faces the critical problems in a way that some recent works of edification has conspicuously failed to do. The book, which has been produced in a form that is a credit to the publishers in these days, will soon establish itself as the inevitable guide to which young students will be referred as they start on their exploration of 'the spiritual Gospel'.

W. F. HOWARD

*The Night is Far Spent.* By Kenneth Ingram. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

We like this book. It is fresh, virile, insistent, and the author, with calm and confident step, pursues his way unwaveringly.

It is a book about revolutionary religion or, to put it in another way, about a revival of religion. And the author, critical of a religion, particularly Christianity, that is sentimental and woolly, is not content simply to indicate the need for revival but firmly submits his judgement of what such a revival involves. Yet the note he strikes is never strident nor his treatment cheap and nasty.

It goes without saying that those who know the author's valuable little book, *The Coming Civilization*, will expect to find in this treatment of revolutionary religion stern criticism of many of the views and attitudes of the Church, and a condemnation, in the light of the Christian ethic, of the present order of Society. In this new book, however, he goes on to speculate about a new gospel (or a new interpretation of the old one) and supplies vigorous if challenging reasons for doing so. Thus he is led into dispute on matters of Public Worship, Holy Communion, Salvation, the Kingdom of Heaven, the divinity of Christ, Immortality, and the ever-recurring question, Is man naturally evil or naturally good? And all this is coupled with a trenchant criticism of Capitalist society. Yet withal, Mr. Ingram has a sure belief in God, delights in the Christian faith, accepts the authority of Jesus and has a concern for the Church. Nevertheless, the reader who is sensitive to criticism of the Church and Society will need to have sympathy and patience with the author, for he has definitely provided strong meat and it may prove rather tough for delicate minds.

*The Night is Far Spent* is based on the thesis that the revolution in human affairs which we are approaching in this stage of our history is a religious event, but that our present religious life is insufficient for the task of the new world. Yet nothing less than a religious force can accomplish the work of world reconstruction. But it must be a revitalized religion. And one of the steps in that direction is that Christians and the Church must come to see that the necessary social and economic changes vital to democracy and civilization are essentially religious. In this he finds the hope of a religious awakening and a rediscovery of the creative intentions of Jesus. Inevitably, therefore, the reader will be forced back upon old but still vitally important questions: What is Christianity? What does religious revival involve? What must Christians and the Churches do? What is their task? And

one of the questions that will seriously exercise the mind of Christians even of those who are sympathetic to the author's position and approve his judgements, is that of the position and mission of the Church in the New Society when gained. For instance, is the Church, in spite of her failures, negligible as an institution in Society? Will she have played her part and then be played out in a classless society? Is Christianity summed up in 'Community'?

Whatever the answers might be to these questions, the author insists that because 'the issue of our day takes primarily the form of a social challenge', it must not be thought that the issue is political: it is a religious issue. 'There is no real division between social and spiritual issues. . . .' And being a religious issue, the new social order cannot be effectively built on man as he is. 'The reformation of the social environment by economic changes must go hand in hand with the reformation of the individual within society.' And there is need of repentance and redemption. Yet even this must be related to social change.

The book, though challenging, is timely. It should prove both helpful and stimulating to those within the Church who have a concern for a new social order. But why this choice of title for a book of this order? We regard the choice as an unfortunate one.

T. W. BEVAN

*Honest Religion.* By John Oman, with an Introduction and Memoir. (Cambridge. 7s. 6d.)

Dr. Oman was one of the few creative thinkers of our day and there is little doubt that his writings will be studied for many years to come. This volume contains the essence of his teaching and it is marked by a lucidity which has not always been found in his larger works. An introduction is provided by the Rev. Frank H. Ballard and brief memoirs are contributed by the Rev. George Alexander and Professor Farmer. The title is significant since Dr. Oman never ceased to plead that we should deal honestly with the highest and holiest as it is revealed to us in the varied experiences of human life. He sought, as Professor Farmer reminds us, to hold together in indissoluble unity the revelation of God to the human spirit—a revelation that shines in its own light and needs for its verification neither the patronage of tradition nor the proofs of philosophy—and the inviolable dignity of man who is called to determine his conduct in accordance with his own insight into what is right and true. Dr. Oman was primarily concerned with the philosophy of religion and it is doubtful whether he would have admitted a distinction between the philosophy of religion and theology. This fact may account for what appears to us to be a very attenuated view of revelation and a most inadequate Christology. In the chapter on 'Jesus and His Kingdom' we are told that the sonship of Jesus was no different except in originality and effect from what we all ought to have. No detailed attempt is made here or elsewhere to show that this conception of our Lord's person can be reconciled with the witness of

the New Testament or with Christian experience throughout the ages. Some readers may also find that the doctrine of reconciliation expounded in these pages is hardly adequate to human need. A diluted Christology must of necessity result in a weakened soteriology.

It is a tribute to the influence of Dr. Oman that so many of his former students are exponents of his views. Through his work at Westminster College, as well as by his books, he succeeded in reaching an audience too vast to number and in permanently enriching the life of the Church as a whole.

HAROLD ROBERTS

*A Plain Man's Life of Christ.* By A. D. Martin. (Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.).

Yet another life of Christ, and let it be said this one meets a real need. The Universal Christ is the Lord of life to-day and the need of the hour calls for an interpretation to our day and generation of the Christ of the Ages. This is the story of the living Christ and one feels when the last page is reached that He may be still touched in life's throng and press. Based primarily on the earliest gospel and incorporating much from the other synoptic records there is a unity in the life, work and teaching of Jesus that is satisfying. The writer of this book has passed into the immediate presence of his Lord, but has left us with warmed hearts because in his book we have seen Jesus. Many of the incidents of His life are lit with new meaning. The chapter on the Synagogue Ministry is a good example of the whole book. The description of the place, the detail of the service, the meaning of the ceremonies and the sermon of Christ on that occasion are vividly portrayed and live in the memory. The final paragraph of the book summarizes the author's achievement. 'In fact, all the world, past, present, and future, is illumined with the glory of God. We know how we ought to live, how only we can ultimately live. We now possess an inward certainty about the nature of that Universe to which we belong, a certainty which tranquillizes and increases all our powers.' Mr. Martin has made clear the purpose and meaning of the life of Christ and the 'plain man' should be truly thankful. The author has wisely appended his notes to the book rather than to the pages.

*The Secrets of Fortitude.* By the Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington Ingram. (Longmans. 2s. 6d.)

The latest book from one who will always be known as London's Bishop combines a volume for advent and lenten reading. For many years this distinguished author arranged for the issue of a suitable lenten book and now adds his own. The addresses here recorded were given to the Forces and emphasize the importance of fortitude in the war tasks which face us. These talks have all the virility of the author's personality and the value of his long experience in spiritual issues. The chapters are brief and effective. The constant reference made to earlier chapters and previous books, while wearying in many cases, does stress the need for the virtue of fortitude at all times and in all circumstances.





## Periodical Literature

### BRITISH

**Hibbert Journal** (October, 1941).—The first three articles in this number have connected themes. They have been written independently without prearrangement or collaboration. In the first, 'End of Balance of Power—What is to Succeed?' by Dr. F. H. Heinemann, the historical course of events leading to the present conflict is reviewed, leading the writer to the declaration that a real balance of power in politics is a mere fiction, and further, the Commonwealth principle in Europe does not lead any further than that; therefore, it is no solution of the problem. The real solution is the unification of Europe. The present war is a day of judgement for the selfish European nations. Germany will remain a centre of unrest until she has disappeared in a Greater Europe. When will the European nations be ripe for such a solution? The second article by Norman Bentwick, 'Mazzini's Message', shows the way of solution. There is no hope except in universal reform and the brotherhood of the peoples of Europe. And it is clear that a new political basis must be found for human society beyond the sovereign national state or civilization will perish. Mazzini had a vision of the whole without which vision the peoples perish. Against the Nazi ideal of one people, one state, one Führer, there is this great man's ideal: one God, one law, one humanity. The third article in its turn goes on to expound this ideal under the title, 'The Oneness of the World', by Dr. Maxwell Garnett. Here a strong plea is made for Christian Education. These first forty pages make a feast for quiet, thoughtful reading. Then there are articles on 'Tagore'; 'Religious Liberty and the B.B.C.'; 'The Scientific Claims of Psychical Research'; and an interesting study, 'Suggestions for a Revised Christology', by Dr. E. L. Allen, in which the plea is made for reality in relation to the language of dogma. Then an arresting subject is discussed by Dr. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, 'The Silence of the New Testament'. The usual Survey of Philosophical and Theological Literature, with Reviews, closes an issue well up to the normally high standard.

**The Journal of Theological Studies** (July-October, 1941).—The article is an interesting paper read a year or two ago before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology by the Dean of Christ Church, Dr. John Lowe. The title is 'An Examination of attempts to detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology'. The writer dismisses the theory that there is a development in the eschatology from a crude Jewish apocalyptic expectation to a steady time perspective, by showing that both in early and later letters the fundamental eschatological outlook is found side by side with the mystical. 'The way he puts things seems to depend on whether the "realized" or the "futurist" eschatology is uppermost in his mind at the moment.' He explodes in a few sentences Canon Wilfred L. Knox's ingenious but untenable theory that Paul abandoned eschatology after the alleged failure of his address before



the Areopagus and gave himself increasingly from that hour to the hellenization of his Gospel. The entire article deserves the closest attention. There are some valuable contributions in the section 'Notes and Studies', and, as always, a number of important reviews. Amongst these we may perhaps call special attention to Prof. Boyd Smith's review of the volume *The Study of Theology* (edited by the Bishop of Oxford), Dr. Wheeler Robinson's review of Dr. Ryder Smith's *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, and Dr. Telfer's review of Dr. Ogg's *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*.

**The Round Table** (September, 1941).—The eighth war number of this quarterly is wide in its survey and farseeing in its policy. The significance of the invasion of Russia is indicated especially with regard to Japanese policy. It calls for the utmost immediate aid to the Soviet Republic. War production is reviewed and its necessity stressed. The strategy of the War on land, sea and in the air is discussed with much acumen. The future of education is a vital problem of post-war reconstruction. The importance of spiritual teaching and leadership is emphasized. The unrest of the Arabs is revealed and its causes explored. The outlook for Ethiopia is full of hope and difficulties. The United States is speeding up its war effort, short of participation, and is mobilizing its forces with commendable zeal. The Irish Free State finds neutrality as difficult as it is unworthy while Northern Ireland in her fine loyalty abides British to the core. India's problems, Great Britain's progress and plans, Canada's economics, Australia's reaction to Crete and internal affairs, South African politics and New Zealand's war effort are all dealt with in turn, with real appreciation of the issues involved.

#### AMERICAN

**The Journal of Religion** (October, 1941).—It is remarkable that three great American quarterlies are anniversary issues. In the case of the *Journal of Religion* it is the jubilee of the Chicago University as well. This issue is concerned with the forward look and has a symposium of ten articles, written by workers in different fields and of differing outlook, on 'What is the Next Task?' The answers are given in papers on 'The Outlook for Theology', 'The Prospect of a Social Theology', 'Co-operation between the Creeds', 'New Trends in Thinking about God', 'Religious Education Faces the Future', 'Old and New Testament Study' and especially that of 'The Acts of the Apostles'. The replies are completed by contributions on 'New Perspectives in Church History' and 'The Role of Historical Theology'. Each task is considered in scholarly fashion and the duties which await us will, when completed, add much to our knowledge and interest in the realms of Theology. Modern religious literature, both European and American, is well surveyed in the reviews offered.

**Religion in Life** (Autumn Number, 1941).—This number opens with a plea for church unity by Dr. H. B. Smith, the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, U.S.A. He bases his argument on

Experience, Efficiency, Influence and Example. Dr. A. E. Day discusses the form of revelation, which lies in meaning and awareness of meaning. George Stewart reveals, in a brief article, Australia's place in the world conflict. Religion and Health is the theme of R. L. Dicks in which he calls for a closer association between the minister and the physician for the good of the community. Herbert Welch bids us build the temple of peace on freedom, order, justice and goodwill, believing that Christ and His gospel of love hold the final answer to the problem. Dr. C. E. Silcox follows much the same line with his survey of Canadian Churches and Post-War Reconstruction. Dr. D. E. Trueblood considers the place of the Meeting House in America. It was the community centre and round it the life of the township turned. That unique position is lost and life is much the poorer. Thomas W. Currie writes clearly on the Psalms and quotes the Fathers and leaders in support. A timely article on French Civilization and French Collapse, by a German professor, Dr. Foerster, is salutary reading. The connection between religion and art is emphasized by an American architect, Dr. R. A. Cram, and his criticism of modern architecture is just. The plight and problem of the Christian colleges for Higher Education in America are vividly pictured in Dr. E. E. Aubrey's article 'Do or Die'. J. S. Bonnell describes in moving fashion his visit to war-torn Britain. Dr. G. M. Gibson expounds the Christian doctrine of Vocation in which he shows that there is an awakening to love and duty on every hand. John C. Schroeder reviews, with much insight, the quarter's fiction, giving pride of place to A. J. Cronin.

**Yale Review** (September, 1941).—This issue marks the thirtieth anniversary of the *Yale Review* and in it the Editor reminisces and John Chamberlain, a fellow editor, looks ahead with rare sagacity. The fare provided in this number is as varied as that of a pre-war hotel menu. It varies from a study of primary literature to that of vitamins and recent biological research, a survey of the American writers and a consideration of the functions of higher education. Professor Tinker writes of Shelley, and Jose Gasset—a Spaniard—reveals the influence of Kant on the modern German mind. In an article on 'Income, Consumption and National Defence', Professor Hansen faces the economic crisis in the New World. The president of a broadcasting company, J. V. L. Hogan, discusses the problems of broadcasters. A Swiss professor, Arnold Wolfers, summarizes, with fine judgement, the strategy of the first two years of the present war. Fiction and critical reviews complete a memorable anniversary number.